SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY
SELINSGROVE, PA.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLIX.

FEBRUARY, 1895.

THE FINANCIAL MUDDLE.

BY THE HON. J. STERLING MORTON, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE; THE HON. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY; AND HENRY W. CANNON, PRESIDENT OF THE CHASE NATIONAL BANK, NEW YORK.

I.

THE present is a composite photograph of all the yesterdays which the human race has counted since it began a civilized career. All the thought, improvement, invention, advancement, and exaltation of mankind evolved during its march through the millions of myriads of yesterdays are concentrated, focused, in the present; and our To-day, analyzed, is only a portrait in miniature of an aggregate Yesterday. Our industries, social life, economics—even our fallacies in finance—are merely a repetition of those of former generations, with additions, amendments, and advancements. Thus, while history repeats itself, it also modifies or magnifies itself in various parts. It embellishes or it tones down, represses or intensifies here and there, as human prejudice or desire may dictate. But nowhere do we read of a different air or water in ancient times—as supporters of human life—from that which we breathe and drink to-day. There has been, then, no abrupt repeal, change, or amendment to natural laws during the mighty marches of the years and centuries across this world of ours since it first trembled in elemental space. The laws of light, of sound, of gravitation and cohesion, remain

Copyright, 1895, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

potent, exacting, and inexorable as when the revolution of the spheres began and the light of day first flooded the universe with its vivifying effulgence. Under the domination of these relentless laws in a great kindergarten the family of Man has been for thousands of years living and learning and repeating lessons. Until the art of printing came to embalm knowledge and perpetuate it, the learning of each generation was entombed almost wholly with those who developed it. Legends, manuscripts, and traditions transmitted only a modicum of the accumulated lore; and the greater volumes of experience and achievement were hidden in the grave with their authors. Nevertheless, certain of those ideas most essential to the advancement and elevation of the social status were so thoroughly esteemed, debated, and written out, that we, as the heirs of the intellectual wealth of all preceding time, now hoard them in libraries and treasure them in our memories. But we are merely trustees, and as such it is our duty to conserve and bequeath that inheritance to our descendants with as much useful increment as we are competent to evolve or produce, as to each integral part thereof. And as trade is the forerunner of civilization, and commerce its promoter and educator, this age is obligated to the future to improve the old and invent new methods for facilitating exchanges all over the world.

In a barbaric state, barter existed. Direct exchanges of goods for goods obtained. Then, emerging from tribal relations, man instituted various media of exchanges. First, cattle were money. Then came flocks of sheep and goats. The larger cattle-owner was the capitalist. The word "capital" coming from *caput*, a head, and the word "pecuniary" from *pecus*, a flock, illustrate the fact that the basic idea of money was value, both inherent and relative. Later on silver and gold became money. But for centuries they were not coined. Both metals were used to mediate exchanges. But neither of them bore any other marking or certification than that given by the goldsmith or the assayer, who merely verified the weight and fineness. His legend on the lump or ingot of bullion assured the trading public as to its purity and gravity. But standard economists never claim that attestation of fineness and weight, either by an assay office in ancient or by a government mint in modern times, adds value to the metals; though all agree that it increases the facility with which they may measure values and mediate the exchanges of commodities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Aristotle, who wrote in the fourth century before Christ, had a clearer idea of the character and functions of money, even in that early morning time of commerce, than many statesmen at this high noon of international trade seem to entertain. And that pagan philosopher said:

"Money is an intermediary *commodity* designed to facilitate an exchange of two other commodities."

And Xenophon, writing of Athens a hundred years later, and showing its advantages over other markets, says:

"In most of the other cities a trader is obliged to take commodities in return for those he brings, because the money used in them has not much credit *outside;* with us Athenians, on the contrary, . . . he takes his pay in *ready money*, which, of all negotiable articles, is the safest and most convenient, as it is secured in all countries, and, besides, it always brings back something to its master, when the latter judges proper to dispose of it."

Thus Aristotle saw the necessity of a *commodity* value in the medium of exchange, and Xenophon demonstrated the importance of a general and unfluctuating purchasing power of value in money, to render it universally useful in the facilitation of domestic and foreign exchanges.

Thus we come to, What is value? Aristotle and the Roman lawyers, among the ancient; and Adam Smith, Whately, Say, and Perry, with a multitude of other modern economists, have declared that value consists in EXCHANGEABILITY. And McLeod says:

"And what does exchangeability depend upon? If I offer something for sale, what is necessary in order that it should be sold? Simply that some one else should *desire* and *demand* it. . . . The sole origin, source, and cause of value is *human desire;* when there is a *demand* for things, they have *value*. When supply remains stationary and the demand increases, the value increases; when the demand decreases, the value decreases, and when the demand ceases altogether, the value is altogether gone."

The currency of a country, therefore, must be always exchangeable for those things which its people desire and demand, and the currency itself must be desired and demanded by those who have the things to sell. The commodity seller buys money; and the commodity buyer sells money. Each seeks the highest quality in that which he buys, because with it he satisfies a demand; and in every legitimate exchange there are two demands and two satisfactions. In times of business depression money circulates cautiously and slowly, because people repress desires

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for many commodities which under usual commercial conditions they gratify. And thus demand for those goods decreases and their values decline. There are many Americans to-day who have their money hoarded merely because they are afraid to indulge in expenditures which, during a period of redundant circulation, they regarded as absolutely necessary to their daily comfort. Repressing desires, they have diminished or destroyed demand in many lines of goods, and yet an active number of citizens declare that the depression is caused solely by an inadequate *per-capita circulation* of money. Generally those citizens, however, while talking of a per-capita *circulation*, are, no doubt, really thinking about a per-capita *distribution*. But in the distribution of money each person can legitimately get only so much as he can honestly buy, either with a personal service or an exchangeable property or commodity. Each person can get money who has something to sell which some other person desires and demands. It makes no difference how plentiful the money supply may be: if one has no exchangeable service or commodity to offer which other persons desire to buy, he will get none of it.

To illustrate. In a community of 1,000 there may be found a *per-capita circulation* of $100. Investigation, however, proves that one citizen has $75,000, another $10,000, and the remaining 998 have only an average of about $15 each. And yet effusive statesmen, posing as the friends of the poor man, pathetically plead for an increased per-capita circulation, as the only certain panacea for poverty, penury, and want everywhere. But these emotional fiatists never tell how any person, who has nothing exchangeable to offer therefor, is to get his per-capita share. These hysterical publicists frequently indulge in economic paroxysms which, nearly always, result in attempts to promote the public weal by enactment, and in endeavors to provide prosperity by embodying fallacies in the forms of law. They totally ignore the fact that exchangeable things are necessary to circulate money—things desired, demanded, and, therefore, valuable. They forget, seemingly, that there is no need of value measures when and where there are no values to measure.

Among the drought-stricken homesteaders in some parts of the sub-arid regions of Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas, there are for sale to-day no edible commodities; and all the gold coin of the earth given to those unfortunates on the famine frontier,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon condition that it shall be used only in purchasing food grown among themselves, can avail nothing in ameliorating their hardships. It would create no exchanges, confer no comforts. A per-capita circulation of $100,000, each, under such restrictions, could alleviate no distress. Food, not funds; clothing, not coin; fuel, not finance—things which are always alert for exchange, because always desired and demanded—can alone assuage their misery. But, by a parity of reasoning, those who advocate more measures of value, a larger number of dollars as the infallible remedy for depressed trade, should now declaim in favor of a larger per-capita circulation of peck, half-bushel, and bushel measures, together with steelyards, and scales, and yardsticks, and foot-rules, among those grainless fields, foodless families, and almost clothesless communities. Yet increased and gratuitous distribution of measures and weights among a hungering people who have neither food to weigh nor fabrics nor fuel to measure, would be a sorry satire upon starvation. But it would be as efficient and efficacious in ameliorating conditions as an increased *per-capita circulation* would be in improving the pecuniary status of those who can offer nothing exchangeable for money which the owners of money desire and demand. The measures of cereals and other material things are useless where there are no cereals or other material things to be measured. And money is absolutely inert and inutile where no values are to be measured and no exchanges are to be mediated. The pioneers of Nebraska, which was opened to settlement in 1854, matured no crops to subsist upon until the autumn of 1855; and, therefore, for their first year's subsistence purchased grain and vegetables and meat from the adjacent States of Iowa and Missouri. And although the tilled area of Nebraska, when the first snow of the winter of 1855 and 1856 fell, was only a few acres, and the population of the Territory very sparse (and, therefore, the necessary and normal exchanges exceedingly limited), there was a large yield of indigenous frontier financiers who fervidly declaimed for more circulating media. These primitive Populists then proclaimed, in that prairie wilderness, the doctrine of commercial salvation and everlasting prosperity through the grace of an increased per-capita circulation. They declared that there was not enough money in Nebraska and adjoining States with which to transact business, and that the Legislative Assembly of the Territory should charter banks to issue money

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in volume sufficient to meet the exigencies of trans-Missouri commerce. Those pioneer advocates of financial vagaries and money fallacies used all the arguments, demagogy, and emotional exhortation in behalf of their theory that their lineal economic descendants and disciples use to-day. And thus, during January, 1856, six banks were chartered for the purpose of making more money for circulation in Nebraska. The legislators who voted for them scouted all the teachings of political economy, and defied the inevitable and efficient operation of economic law in antagonism to a statute of their own sapient spawning. And here is the act which created a currency (each of six banks having precisely the same charter) of more than $600,000 in less than six months, ostensibly to be circulated among a population of less than 20,000 men, women, and children, who made up all the inhabitants of the Territory, which then included all the geographical area that now constitutes the two Dakotas, Wyoming, and a part of Colorado. In less than four months from the commencement of this experiment for banishing poverty and producing prosperity by an increased per-capita circulation, the gold currency and its equivalents had disappeared. The far-seeing accumulator of sound money and the non-resident traders had taken it from the limited field of our exchanges, and had hoarded, hidden, and carried it away.

AN ACT

FOR THE CHARTER OF A BANK, TO BE LOCATED IN BELLEVUE, DOUGLAS COUNTY, NEBRASKA TERRITORY, TO BE CALLED THE FONTENELLE BANK OF BELLEVUE.

SEC. 1. *Be it enacted by the Council and House of Representatives of the Territory of Nebraska*, That Jno. R. Sarpy, Peter A. Sarpy, Samuel Knepper, Jno. R. Cecil, L. B. Kinny, Philip J. McMahon, Leavitt L. Bowen, Jno. Clancy, their heirs and assigns, are hereby appointed commissioners, and they or any five of them are authorized to carry into effect, from and after the passage of this act, the establishment of a bank, to be styled and called the Fontenelle Bank, and to be located at Bellevue, Douglas County, Nebraska Territory, with a capital of $100,000, which may be increased, at the will of the stockholders, to any amount not exceeding $500,000, to be divided into shares of $100 each; and the said company, under the above name and style, be and are hereby declared capable in law of issuing bills, notes, and other certificates of indebtedness, dealing in exchange, and doing all things necessary to the carrying on of a regular and legitimate banking business, and also, to buy and possess property of all kinds, and to sell and dispose of the same, to contract and be contracted with, to sue and to be sued, to defend and to be defended against in all courts in this Territory.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SEC. 2. That the commissioners herein appointed shall have power to cause books to be opened for the subscription of said stock in such manner and at such times and places as they or any five of them may appoint; that whenever $50,000 is fully subscribed, then those making such subscription shall have power to choose a board of directors, whose duty it shall be to organize said bank by electing a president, vice-president, and cashier, and that in the election of said directors and officers each share subscribed or then held shall entitle the holder thereof to one vote, which may be given in person or by proxy.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the president or vice-president (either of whom shall be competent) and cashier to attach their respective names to all bills or notes issued by said bank to circulate as currency, and that the stockholders shall be each and individually liable for the full and final redemption of such issue, payable at the banking house in gold or silver, and that this charter shall have an existence and be in full force, if faithfully complied with, for the term of twenty-five years from the date of its passage and becoming a law of the Territory.

SEC. 4. The stock of said bank shall be assignable and transferable, according to such rules and under such restrictions as the board of directors may prescribe, who shall have power at all times to make such rules and regulations as may appear for the well-being of said bank, not inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States and the organic law of this Territory.

SEC. 5. The directors of the bank shall make, or cause to be made, through their cashier, under oath or affirmation, an annual report to the Auditor of the Territory or State (as the case may be), a full exhibit of the condition of said bank, which report shall be published in three newspapers of this Territory by said auditor.

SEC. 6. This act shall be in force from and after its passage.

Approved January 18, 1856.

Very soon after this manufactory of credit money began to pour its product into trade channels, the superior money had, under the operation of the Gresham law, surrendered the field of exchange to the inferior. And from the date of the letter which Sir Thomas Gresham wrote to Queen Elizabeth in 1558, explaining that good and bad moneys could not remain concurrent in the same country, no more perfect verification of the Gresham law had ever arisen than that furnished by that Territory in the years of 1856, 1857, and 1858. The unyielding vigor of Principle and Truth was as pronounced in Nebraska then as it had been in the Kingdom of Great Britain 300 years before.

Thus after a brief period of pseudo-prosperity, in which all values were feverishly enhanced, there came, in June, 1857, the first warnings of the disastrous panic of that year. In New York the banking and brokerage house of John Thompson, who published a bank-note reporter and counterfeit detector, failed. In

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ohio the great Life and Trust Company went under, and all over Nebraska, and throughout the whole Republic, the baseless, non-convertible paper issues of "stump-tail" currency—as it was termed in the parlance of the time—became utterly valueless as tools of exchange.

To-day we stand perhaps upon the very verge of another era of fiatism. And if the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 can be secured, we shall behold again, in the United States, and on a broader field, the unavoidable and disastrous effect of that law which inevitably prevents the circulation of an inferior and a superior currency, in the same markets, at the same time.

Having, under free coinage, made more silver dollars than the country can float, at a parity with gold, the latter metal will go to a premium. All that we sell to foreigners will be paid for in silver. All that we buy of them will be settled for in gold, and we will pay the premium. Bimetallism, as taught by the free-coinage-of-silver advocates, who maintain that the United States alone can float unlimited amounts of that metal, coined at a ratio of 16 to 1, on a parity with gold, logically leads to mono-metallism in the North American republic, and that one metal must inevitably be silver.

In the *Nineteenth Century* Henry Dunning McLeod says:

> Bimetallism is only part of a system which prevailed in every country for centuries. Statesmen thought that they could regulate the value of commodities by law, and the statute books contained many such laws. But experience showed that such laws were absolutely inoperative, and, after having been abandoned in practice, were, at length, expunged from the statute book. The attempt to restore bimetallism is simply the endeavor to revive this exploded economic fallacy.
>
> If it were possible to establish a fixed ratio between gold and silver by international agreement, it would be equally possible to fix the value of all commodities. Innumerable catastrophes are caused by the unexpected change in the value of commodities; why not then fix the value of all commodities, and so remove the cause of multitudes of mercantile calamities?
>
> Agriculturists are suffering the extremest depression from the fall in the value of their products. Why then not fix the value of wheat at a remunerative price by international agreement? If it were printed in all the statute books of the world that the price of wheat should be one dollar a bushel, does any person of common sense suppose that the price of wheat would rise one cent?

And if raising wheat could be made remunerative everywhere, would not everybody seek that line of production?

But the bimetallists state their case paradoxically when they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proclaim for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. That very phraseology is a confession that there is and can be but one unit of value. The fact that they compare their silver to gold, as the unit of value, as the test of exchangeability, contradicts their contention for the equal utility and facility of the two metals in mediating exchanges. It is a full confession of the bimetallists that the two metals are unequal. It is an avowal that by law—mere statutory enactment—they propose to make equal, in value, by certain relations, those things which mankind do not equally desire and demand. They affirm that they will create value. They avow that they can stimulate the desire and enhance the demand of the world for silver by a simple "Be it Enacted"—a formulation of fallacies into statutes. It is a plain concession that silver is a commodity which must be measured by a universally accepted measure; and, furthermore, that gold is that measure. Therefore, by implication, the professed bimetallist, in stating his case, admits that he is a gold monometallist.

But it is amazing to find ardent free traders among the zealous advocates of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, because the present tariff provides almost wholly for ad-valorem duties. Such duties, according to the law, must be paid upon the valuation of the commodity imported, computed in the currency of the United States.*

With free coinage, which, we are cheerfully and vehemently assured, will bring about a double price for all the farmers have to sell, there will also then come a double valuation upon all ad-valorem imports which farmers may wish to buy. Then a thousand pounds' worth of English manufacture, bought in London on a gold basis, being imported to the United States, while we are on a silver basis, valued in our market and our money, as the law

* SEC. 25. That the value of foreign coin as expressed in the money of account of the United States shall be that of the pure metal of such coin of standard value; and the values of the standard coins in circulation of the various nations of the world shall be estimated quarterly by the Director of the Mint, and be proclaimed by the Secretary of the Treasury immediately after the passage of this act, and thereafter quarterly on the first day of January, April, July, and October, in each year. And the values so proclaimed shall be followed in estimating the value of all foreign merchandise exported to the United States during the quarter for which the value is proclaimed, and the date of the consular certification of any invoice shall, for the purposes of this section, be considered the date of exportation: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may order the reliquidation of any entry at a different value, whenever satisfactory evidence shall be produced to him showing that the value in United States currency of the foreign money specified in the invoice was, at the date of certification, at least ten per centum more or less than the value proclaimed during the quarter in which the consular certification occurred. (Statutes U. S., Fifty-third Congress, Sess. II., Ch. 349, Sec. 25.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compels, will cost twice as much denominationally, in silver, as it would in gold. That is, gold being then worth twice as much as silver, instead of paying, on each English pound, as to-day, on a valuation of $4.86, the consumer will be taxed for each English pound's worth of goods, reduced to United States currency, on a valuation of $9.72. Then, as silver declines and cheaper money becomes more and more plentiful, our Free Trade friends who have joined the crusade in behalf of free coinage will sorrowfully observe that they have, by their misinformed statesmanship, erected a mountain barrier to international trade, compared to which McKinleyism was a mere molehill. Free coinage, as advocated by its most enthusiastic and eloquent supporters—those who paroxysmally appeal for the poor people, as against plutocrats—will very soon, if it be attained, double and possibly treble the duties on all the imports which poor people purchase.

These same self-constituted attorneys for the poor, out of their tumultuous and cheerful vocabulary, also plead strenuously in the interests of those whom they felicitously, without definition or identification, call the "debtor classes." Money, they say, has appreciated since some debts were contracted, and, therefore, it is a great hardship upon some debtors to pay as they borrowed. But suppose the money had not been loaned by its owners? Suppose all the owners of money had securely hoarded it, instead of loaning it out, when asked, in each case, would not money, thus becoming scarcer, have appreciated still more by the hoarding? Is the bimetallist, then, in favor of a law providing a penalty for appreciating the purchasing power by hoarding money, and not loaning it? Why should there be no law to prevent enhancement of purchasing power brought about by hoarding, if there must be a statute to mitigate that enhancement which may occur by loaning money?

Frequently, in the early settlements of the West, farmers supplied the new-comers, arriving in the autumn, enough grain, payable in kind, quality, and quantity, to carry them through the next season, and to a matured harvest of their own cereals.

To illustrate. A loaned B 500 bushels of corn worth 25 cents a bushel, January 1, 1894, to be repaid with 550 bushels of corn on January 1, 1895. But, because of the drouth and scarcity of corn in the fall of 1894, it has doubled in price and sells on the first day of this year for 50 cents a bushel. Now by a similar

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

process of reasoning, the bimetallist should call for a statute enabling A to pay B his 550 bushels of corn with 550 bushels of oats which are worth only 30 cents a bushel. The corn having appreciated, because of the changed relation of the supply of corn to the demand for corn, has worked a hardship, under the inexorable operation of economic law, against B.

And the economic law is an evolution of that natural law which regulates the rainfall and the sunshine and makes crops, either bountiful or meagre. Now would not the same morality, honesty, and sense of justice, which provide for the payment of a money debt created since we were on a gold basis—that is, since January, 1879—in depreciated dollars, made either of silver or any other commodity, also pay a loan of 500 bushels of corn, borrowed in 1894, with 550 bushels of oats in 1895; or, if in corn, then in troy weight instead of avoirdupois; or, if by measure, then with two pecks to the bushel?

Du Maurier describes the wonderful vocalization of Trilby, as

"waves of sweet and tender laughter, the very heart and essence of innocent, high-spirited girlhood, alive to all that is simple and joyous and elementary in nature—the freshness of the morning, the ripple of the stream, the click of the mill, the lisp of wind in the trees, the song of the lark in the cloudless sky—the sun and the dew, the scent of early flowers and summer woods and meadows—the sight of birds and bees and butterflies and frolicsome young animals at play—all the sights and scents and sounds that are the birthright of happy children, happy savages in favored climes—things within the remembrance and the reach of most of us! All this, the memory and the feel of it, are in Trilby's voice as she warbles that long, smooth, lilting, dancing laugh, that wondrous song without words; and those who hear, feel all, and remember it with her. It is irresistible; it forces itself on you; no words, no pictures, could ever do the like!"

But the music was that of her mesmeric master. The potency of his magic swayed her whole being—voice, features, pose, gestures, everything—in one grand, breathing symphony. So the harmonies of civilization, the multifold tones of Trade, all the great choruses and melodies of Commerce—the murmuring stream that turns the mill wheel, the hissing engine on the rail, the plash of the paddle-wheel on inland lakes, the monotonous pulsations of the great hearts of steamships on all the oceans of the globe, the singing wires of telegraph lines hanging in the air, the whir of the electric cars—every movement of a sentient commerce transporting from north to south, from south to north, from east to west, and from west to east, with all its myriad sounds of con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tented industry—are merely the economic orchestra of Civilization obeying the motions of the magic baton of Demand, wielded by the will-power of the civilized world. These are the marvelous melodies of modern commerce. But the inspiration which gives voice to value, and energizes the many-tongued industries of modern life, advancements, and improvements, is EXCHANGEABILITY based upon demand, which is founded upon desire.

And so, theorize as we may, contend for whatever financial faith we can, and legislate as we will, we shall find at last that in our Present the foundations of finance are, as they were in the Past of a thousand years ago, buttressed by human desires and human demands for exchangeable things. And the Future will finally, perhaps, after many severe strains upon the credit of the Republic, behold the citizens of the United States in their honesty and strength with one voice unequivocally declaring for a unit—a measure of value—a medium of exchange—fashioned out of or founded upon gold. They will thus determine and declare, because that metal has been tested and approved for 500 years by the domestic and foreign trade of all the commercial nations of Europe as the only measure of value, the only facilitator of exchanges which civilized mankind has as yet discovered, adopted, and utilized with nearly universal success and almost complete satisfaction.

J. STERLING MORTON.

II.

THE financial system of the United States is the result of a series of enactments. Each act of Congress upon the subject was passed for the purpose of improving some condition or supplying some want which then existed. The result has been that our system is not in accord with any of the recognized principles of a sound currency. There are at this time nine different kinds of coins and paper money in circulation. The paper currency consists of gold and silver certificates, two kinds of Treasury notes, currency certificates, and national bank notes. The legal-tender Treasury notes, amounting at this time to $346,681,016, had their origin in our civil war. The Treasury or Sherman notes, amounting January 1st, 1895, to $150,823,731, were issued under the Act of July 14, 1890, which act the Democratic platform of 1892 denounced as a political makeshift. It proved to be a Pandora's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

box, from which proceeded all manner of financial ills. It certainly produced widespread disaster. The section of the act which required the Secretary of the Treasury to issue Treasury notes in the purchase of 4,500,000 ounces of silver bullion per month was the principal cause of the financial crisis of 1893, which was in a measure arrested by the repealing act passed at the first session of the present Congress. These so-called Sherman notes and the legal-tender notes, which now aggregate nearly $500,000,000 are all payable in coin. The Treasury Department has universally held that good faith requires their payment in gold coin. There are many persons who are of the opinion that the Secretary of the Treasury should pay these notes in silver, and that such payments would be strictly in accordance with the terms of the contract. This view of the case is predicated upon the fact that if such a contract existed between one man and another the debtor would be justified in paying in either coin, and no lack of good faith could be imputed to him for so doing. But between the government and a private individual as in this case the conditions are materially changed. The government has authorized the coinage of a silver dollar which now contains less than fifty per cent. of intrinsic value as compared with gold. The coinage of silver dollars has been limited, and has now ceased altogether and the government in its various acts, and especially in the Act of July 14, 1890, has declared it to be a part of its policy to maintain the parity of the standard silver dollar with the gold dollar. There can be but one meaning to this declared policy of the government; and that is that the government will make the silver dollars which it has coined as good as gold dollars. The government having made this pledge to the holders of these coins, it is not for it to say to its creditors which is the better of the two or which it will prefer to pay; but it is the right of every creditor of the government to say: "You have declared by solemn enactment that these two dollars shall be equal in value, and I prefer the gold dollar, it being the same in value to you as the other." This determination of the government to pay in gold all of the Treasury notes has made the gold reserves the most convenient resource for obtaining gold for a settlement of all foreign balances and also for replenishing the gold reserves, which our own bankers desire to keep. The constant presentation of green-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

backs at the Treasury of the United States, and the demand for their payment in gold, have necessitated the issue of bonds during the last twelve months to the amount of $100,000,000, and the gold reserve is continually being reduced. In view of the fact that greenbacks and Treasury notes will procure gold at any time, they are hoarded by the banks; and silver certificates, which have been issued to the amount of $336,924,504, are principally used for paying dues to the government. The greenbacks and Treasury notes serve the purpose of taking the gold out of the Treasury, and the silver certificates serve the purpose of keeping it out. These conditions have caused the gold reserve to be regarded as the financial barometer of the country; and as the gold reserve goes down, anxiety and uncertainty increase. What remedy can be applied at this time? The Secretary of the Treasury, in his recent report to Congress, has recommended the passage of a bill which, if it shall become a law, will, in a measure, relieve the situation. This measure, known as the Carlisle Bill, proposes to amend the national banking laws so as to dispense with the bond security now required, and to permit the issue of national bank notes to the extent of seventy-five per cent. of the unimpaired capital of the bank, secured by a deposit in the Treasury of the United States of legal-tender and Sherman notes to the extent of thirty per cent. upon the amount of circulation applied for. These bank notes are to be further secured by a safety fund contributed by the banks in the system, amounting to five per cent. upon the whole circulation, and also by a first lien upon the assets of the bank, including the amount which may be received from the double liability of the stockholders. The details of this bill are so well understood that I will not undertake to state them further. The question has been frequently argued, How will such a measure as this relieve the present situation? In the first place it will create a demand for legal-tender notes to the amount of thirty per cent. of the circulation, to be taken out under the act. This demand can only be satisfied by the deposit of legal-tender and Sherman notes. They will therefore be in greater demand than gold itself, for they will perform an important function in business that gold itself cannot perform, viz., form the basis of a circulating medium. It is well known that the mere fact that United States bonds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could be used as a security for national-bank circulation appreciated largely their value; and if such use appreciated the value of the bonds, why would not the similar use created for the legal-tender notes appreciate their value? If legal-tender notes, therefore, were more valuable in the market than gold, they would not be taken to the Treasury for the purpose of demanding gold for them. There is also a provision in the Carlisle bill which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to use any surplus revenue that may at any time be in the Treasury, in the purchase and cancellation of legal-tender notes. But to prevent the possibility of a contraction of the currency it is further provided that such cancellation shall not exceed the net increase of circulation which may be taken out under the act.

The United States Government, in the issue of the legal-tender and Sherman notes and in its promise to redeem them on demand in coin, has established practically a national bank having a circulation of nearly $500,000,000. There has been for two years past a constant run upon this bank. There are several ways in which banks stop runs of this kind. One is to borrow money of other banks or individuals, the course which the United States has been pursuing heretofore. Another is to change the character of their indebtedness from call demands to time obligations; that is, fund the indebtedness which is due into notes or bonds running for such length of time as will enable the bank to prepare for their payment. This is the remedy which it is proposed by some the government of the United States shall now adopt, viz., fund the legal-tender and Sherman notes into interest paying bonds. But the most effectual mode of stopping a run upon a bank is to re-establish public confidence. As soon as depositors and other creditors are satisfied of the ability of the bank or the government to pay all demands upon it, the desire for immediate payment ceases, and the business of the bank progresses as if no distrust had existed. The Carlisle bill would, if passed, restore public confidence. Its passage would demonstrate that the government of the United States will ultimately pay all its indebtedness. It would establish a currency system which would relieve the government from the obligation and necessity of the current redemption of the circulating medium. The government would retire from banking and leave the currency to be regulated by the business needs of the country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some criticism has been made on the Carlisle bill upon the ground, as it is alleged, that it would produce inflation. This criticism is unfounded. There can be no inflation of prices by a currency which is convertible into coin, or into lawful money which is equivalent to coin. In all cases where currency has inflated prices, the increase in prices has been caused by the depreciation of the currency, and not by the volume of such currency in circulation. A convertible currency performs only those functions which coin would perform if the currency were not in existence. If there is more currency in existence than is required for those transactions in which currency actually passes, it will lie idle in the vaults of the banks or in the pockets of the people. There is now in existence in our great cities and in the country generally a large amount of surplus currency. This does not produce inflation. There is simply no use for it in those transactions in which money is actually used. It lies idle in the banks and has no effect whatever upon the prices of commodities. When there is a demand for this currency, it will go out and circulate among the people; and when it has performed those transactions in which it actually passes, it will again return to the vaults of the banks.

There is a prevalent opinion in the minds of many that if the whole money in circulation were doubled, prices would be doubled; and if the currency should be increased to any extent, prices of commodities would be increased in like proportion. This heresy has produced more perplexity and confusion than all the other financial heresies which have ever been advanced. It implies an entire misconception of the functions of money. It is predicated upon the false assumption that all the commodities in the market constitute the demand for all the money, and that all the money constitutes the demand for all the commodities; that all the commodities are to be exchanged for all the money, and thus that the amount of the money is equal to the value of the commodities. John Stuart Mill, one of the greatest writers on political economy, fell into this error, and is responsible in a great measure for its wide dissemination and acceptance by others. A moment's reflection will serve to explode this theory. Argument is scarcely necessary. Facts can be cited. The President of the Bimetallic League of the United States, who appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency in December last, made

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the broad statement that "Prices depend on the proportion of the volume of money in a country as compared with commodities." But when his attention was called to the fact that in France the *per-capita* circulation was $42 and in England $18 and that there was no such difference in prices between the two countries as these figures indicated, he stated that the circulation is supplemented by bank credits, which also affect prices, and that when bank credits are taken into consideration in the two countries the currency of each of those countries is about the same. That statement was hastily made, but its truth is necessary to maintain the theory. A careful investigation, however, shows that the facts do not sustain him. In England the per-capita circulation of gold, silver, and paper money in 1890 was $18, and the per-capita circulation of banking capital, right of issue, and deposits in all banks was $120, making an aggregate per-capita of such circulation of $138. In France the per-capita circulation of gold, silver, and paper money was at that time $42, and the per-capita of banking capital, right of issue, and deposits in all banks was $35, making an aggregate per capita of such circulation of $77. If this theory were true, the prices in England as compared with those in France would be as 77 in France is to 138 in England. The mere statement of the proposition refutes itself, for everybody knows that the difference in prices of commodities in those two countries is the cost of transportation between one country and the other, and the added customs duties which either country may impose. In fact, this is practically the difference in prices between all countries, and the volume of circulating medium, whether it includes the banking credits or not, has nothing whatever to do with the prices of commodities in such country. The aggregate per capita of money and bank credits in other countries of the world in 1890 shows as great a disparity as is shown between England and France. Such per capita in Germany was $43.54; in Russia, $12.66; in Austria, $26.75; in Spain, $28.56; in Belgium, $53.53; in Holland, $58.88; in the United States, $105.40; in Australia, $211.75; and in Canada $53.56.* In view

* The data from which these facts were compiled will be found in two tables of statistics, one in Mulhall's *Dictionary of Statistics* (1892), page 76, and the other in Richard P. Rothwell's *Universal Bimetallism* (1893), page 6. It is possible that the paper money circulation was embraced in both the tables referred to; if so the per capitas should be reduced as follows: England to $136.68; France to $74 91; Germany to $41.78; Russia to $8.24; Austria to $20.20; Spain to $23; Belgium to $44.68; Holland to $50; United States to $99.16; and Canada to $44.67. The disparity is as great in either case.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these facts the assumption that the volume of coin and currency, or the volume of coin, currency, and bank credits in a country, determines the prices of commodities in such country is without any foundation whatever.

In the actual transactions of business all contracts are expressed in money, but trade is merely the bartering of one commodity for another. The price is stated in money, and the commodity is first bartered for coin or its equivalent estimated upon the cost of production of each. When a person sells his commodities, he uses the coin to procure other commodities, and thus the barter is complete. But coin is not always passed in the transaction. In fact the most careful investigations in this country and in Europe have demonstrated that less than five per cent. of the transactions in trade are consummated by the passing of actual money, coin or paper. Checks, bills of exchange, and book accounts form ninety-five per cent. of all the moneyed transactions of the country. The five per cent. of all transactions which call for the actual use of money cannot be regarded as equalling the value of the ninety-five per cent. of commodities where no money whatever passes.

International trade is carried on in the same way as domestic. When goods are shipped from one country to another they are paid for by bills of exchange, and these bills of exchange are purchased from the bankers in the respective countries. A thousand millions of dollars worth of commodities may be sent from this country to other countries in one year, and if another thousand millions of products come back to pay for them, there would be no necessity for a dollar in money to pass between the two countries. The exported commodities would simply be exchanged for the imported commodities, and if an equal amount went each way there would be no balance to settle. And this is true whether the value of the goods were $1,000,000,000 or whether it were only $1,000,000. If the trade of this country with another country were only $1,000,000 in a year, and if we should get only $900,000 worth of goods in return, we would be compelled to send $100,000 in gold to make up the difference. So that in this case it would require more money to be paid in $1,000,000 of transactions than in $1,000,000,000, where the values of the commodities exchanged were equal. The transactions in a great city like New York will further illustrate this matter. The Clearing-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

House serves the purpose of exchanging one kind of commodity with another. The transactions of the day might amount to $100,000,000, and $1,000,000 of actual money might be all which would be required. The same amount might be required in settling the balances when the aggregate was only $10,000,000. So that the volume of the currency in circulation does not affect the prices of the commodities in the slightest degree. If there is a sufficient volume of money in circulation to perform those transactions in which money is actually passed, any excess of this amount will serve no useful purpose, and will not affect in the slightest degree the prices of commodities.

These general observations will serve the purpose of dispelling any apprehension which may exist in the minds of those who anticipate inflation of prices through excessive issues of bank currency. As before stated it must be assumed at all times that the bank currency is perfectly safe and that the notes will be paid at all times on demand in coin or its equivalent.

It is the opinion of the best financiers of the country that the security provided in the Carlisle bill is ample, and that under no possible conditions could the noteholder ever lose anything. If this bill could be enacted into law it would furnish a currency which would be sufficient under all conditions for the wants of trade and commerce. By reason of the convertibility of the notes, and the further fact that every bank would be required to redeem its own notes, and that notes could be issued bottomed chiefly upon the assets of the bank without requiring the purchase of United States bonds to be deposited as security therefor, there would be perfect elasticity in the system. A country situated as is ours requires an elastic currency. In the seasons of the year when crops are being moved a much larger volume of currency is required than at other times. In Canada it has been estimated that the increase of the paper circulation when the crops are being moved amounts to twenty per cent. upon the whole volume. A similar increase is required in this country. This fact shows that in the United States at least $200,000,000 more are required for the transaction of business when the crops are being moved than at other seasons of the year. Our currency system should be so constituted that this increase would be permitted promptly, and as promptly retired when the necessity for the increase has ceased. The amount of notes that would be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in circulation could not be controlled by the banks. They could not put out a dollar without giving it away unless some person or corporation applied for it and required it for use in his or its business. The man who goes through the South buying cotton and paying for it in bank notes is expanding the circulating medium. The man who goes through the agricultural regions of the country buying grain or cattle is expanding the circulation. The banker is powerless to put one dollar in circulation except such as is required by the business transactions of the country in which currency is actually used. What is needed, therefore, in this country is a sound, sufficient, and elastic circulating medium. Any measure which secures these ends and takes the Government of the United States out of the banking business will bring the desired relief to the Treasury, will establish confidence in our financial system, and give assurance to the whole world that the people of the United States will conduct the affairs of this government upon sound financial principles, and that they will sacredly observe and meet all of its obligations.

WILLIAM M. SPRINGER.

III.

THE embarrassment of our financial situation is occasioned by the necessity of maintaining the paper money issued by the Government upon a gold basis, and this embarrassment is intensified by the fact that more than one-half of the currency issued by the Government is based upon silver—which has been demonetized as full legal tender money by the other principal nations.

In the early days of the Republic the wisest and best men of that time were opposed to the issue of paper money in any form, and in the Federal Convention there was bitter opposition to granting the power of issuing currency to the Government. With the exigencies of the Civil War began the evolution which has brought about the present financial situation. In 1862, for the first time in the history of the United States, notes were issued possessing legal-tender quality. They were, at first, fundable into United States bonds; and, very likely, if this provision had not been repealed, they would, like previous issues, have disappeared from circulation. The Supreme Court, reversing a former de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cision, made them legal tender for all debts, and gave them permanent circulation as money.

It is not my intention to rehearse, at length, the financial history of the last thirty years, but it is necessary, in order to consider what remedies are best adapted to the present condition of affairs, to briefly review the action of the Government in relation to currency matters since 1862. There were issued under the acts of 1862 and 1863, legal-tender notes amounting to $449,479,222, which were reduced in 1878 to $346,681,016, and that amount was fixed as the maximum of this form of money. The Coinage Act of February 28, 1878, provided for an issue of standard silver dollars weighing 412½ grains, 900 fine, being at about the ratio (as silver is to gold) of 16 to 1. Under this act there has been coined 422,426,749 silver dollars, and while only 57,889,000 of these coins are at present in circulation, silver certificates representing the remainder are in use as money.

In 1890 a law was enacted repealing a portion of the Act of 1878, and directing the purchase each month of 4,500,000 ounces of silver and the issuance of Treasury notes against the same. Under this law (which was repealed in 1893) $150,823,000 of Treasury notes were issued against purchases of silver bullion. In addition to legal-tender notes, silver dollars (and silver certificates representing the latter), and Treasury notes representing silver bullion purchases, laws have been adopted providing for the issuance of gold certificates against deposits of gold coin, and legal-tender certificates against deposits of United States notes. These issues, however, being substantially warehouse receipts, do not bear directly upon the consideration of the general currency situation. The Treasury Department has for years been virtually a bank of issue. In addition to issuing its own currency, the Treasury has acted as redemption agent for the National Bank notes, which are guaranteed by the Government and secured by deposits of Government bonds; and while the practice of a government issuing paper money has been condemned by students of political economy, the paper money of the United States has been eminently satisfactory to our people. Every facility has been given for the transfer of notes from one part of the country to another, thus reducing the price of domestic exchange to a minimum. Mutilated notes have been promptly replaced with new currency, and the Government has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been prepared at all times to exchange the various denominations of money whenever desired. All of our currency, including the notes of National banks, has, since the resumption of specie payments, been redeemable on demand in gold or silver coin at the option of the holder. Unfortunately, however, our Government issues are not upon a proper basis, as more than one-half of the paper money in circulation has been issued against silver, and the balance is simply evidence of debt—a forced loan upon the people.

During the last twenty years the principal nations of the world have gradually been demonetizing silver as full legal-tender money, and now insist that gold is the only money possessing full debt-paying power. It was not remarkable that the demonetization of silver by France and Germany, beginning with 1873, was not then seriously regarded by the people of our country as, at that time, both gold and silver were at a premium in the United States. Furthermore, for several years after the passage of the silver coinage act in 1878, the restrictions imposed upon National Bank note circulation caused a decrease in its volume, this diminution being the result of the continued war tax of one per cent. per annum upon National Bank notes outstanding, and because notes to the extent of only ninety per cent. of the par value of United States bonds deposited as security can be issued by the banks. Hence National Bank notes outstanding have been reduced from $354,128,250 outstanding in 1875 to $201,845,000 on January 1, 1895. The coinage of standard silver dollars and the issuance of certificates against the same only added a sufficient amount of currency to satisfy the demands of increasing business, and as the balance of our trade with foreign countries was favorable to us, our people did not realize that we were issuing an inferior currency. Furthermore, the supply of gold in the country and the amount in the Treasury was ample for all our requirements. Since the resumption of specie payments, until recently, no difficulty has been experienced in obtaining any amount of gold required, either for domestic use or for shipment abroad to settle adverse balances; and although a number of the officials of the Treasury Department, and many of our thoughtful bankers and business-men, have felt that it was unwise for the Government to continue to issue currency, our legislators have been reluctant to make any alteration in our cur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rency system, as it has for many years proven its efficiency and utility.

For several years past general trade conditions throughout the world have been unsettled, and owing to the low price of agricultural products which are the principal exported articles from this country, and also to the reluctance of investors abroad to purchase our securities or enter upon new business ventures in this country, the balance of trade has been against us. This has resulted in large and frequent shipments of gold to Europe to settle that balance. Under the circumstances it is not unnatural that the present unsatisfactory condition of trade and commerce in this country should be attributed to our complex currency system. As a matter of fact, gold exportations result from causes other than currency conditions. Our unparalleled prosperity in former years induced our people to freely purchase abroad objects of art, luxuries, and many manufactured articles, and while formerly such purchases were offset by shipments of commodities and by sales of securities to European investors (except during brief periods) we now feel keenly the general depressed condition of trade throughout the world. Furthermore, as European investors have of late seriously questioned our ability to maintain gold payments, it is necessary, in order to restore complete prosperity, that we should compete in the markets of the world with our goods and commodities, and also reconstruct our currency system.

We do not share in this apprehension of investors regarding maintenance of a gold issue, and are confident that, even if no change is made in our currency system, our government will maintain gold payments at any cost. Our present financial condition is, in many respects, more satisfactory than it was prior to the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act, which compelled us to inflate our currency regardless of business requirements, and we now realize that whatever may be the relative position of gold to silver, in the commercial world, we are compelled to settle our exchanges upon a gold basis, and we have abandoned the idea of this country alone fixing the ratio between gold and silver as money metals, and our Government must act accordingly.

While the Government cannot evade its obvious duty in the maintenance of gold payments, it is also plain that our currency system should be modified and simplified; but this should be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undertaken only after a most careful consideration of the subject in all its aspects. Our circulating medium should not be subjected to any sudden change which might disturb business confidence. The Government having hitherto provided us with paper money, it cannot discontinue its task without first providing ample safeguards covering bank note issues—if the latter are to supplant our present form of currency. In the mean time it must maintain all of its currency on a gold basis. Furthermore, Government disbursements at present exceed its receipts, and, as this state of affairs may continue for some time, provision should be made to meet any deficiency that may arise. To accomplish this and provide for the maintenance of gold payments and arrange for the retirement of Government paper money, it is necessary that the Secretary of the Treasury should have the power—

First. To borrow money, when necessary to meet deficiency, by issuing therefor short-term obligations under proper restrictions.

Second. To issue bonds payable in gold coin, on short or long time, as may be best adapted to the money market and most advantageous to the Government, so that we may compete in the markets of the world for a sufficient supply of gold to provide additional reserve and maintain all of our paper money on a gold basis.

Third. To issue long-time bonds at a low rate of interest, to provide funds to redeem such Government notes as it may seem desirable to withdraw from circulation from time to time.

These requirements being met, we can then safely consider the question of a larger issue of bank notes to supplant the Government paper money to be retired.

The growth of public sentiment during the past year in opposition to the Government issue of paper money, and in favor of substituting bank-note issues therefor, has been pronounced, and several bills have been introduced in Congress which provide for the issue of unsecured bank notes by both National and State institutions, and suggestions have been made that the United States notes issued in 1862 and Treasury notes issued under the Act of 1890 for the purchase of silver bullion should be retired.

None of the measures pending, however, is sufficiently comprehensive to remedy the evils they seek to correct.

The currency obligations of the Government at the present time

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in circulation and in the Treasury (exclusive of gold certificates, currency certificates, silver dollars outstanding, and subsidiary silver) which the Government is compelled to protect by a sufficient gold reserve are as follows:

United States notes	$346,681,016
Treasury notes (under Act, July 14, 1890)	150,823,731
Silver certificates	336,924,504
	$834,429,251

In addition to the above there are $201,845,738 National Bank notes outstanding, guaranteed by the Government, which are in the same category. It is evident that if provision be made for the retirement of the United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890, leaving the responsibility for the redemption of National Bank notes to the banks themselves, the Treasury will still have to contend with $336,924,504 of silver certificates, representing standard silver dollars, and will also be compelled to keep $57,889,090 of silver dollars, now outstanding, at par and interchangeable with gold; and should any of the bills now pending before Congress providing for the issue of bank notes be passed, such notes might be redeemed in silver dollars which are unlimited legal tender, the silver certificates being redeemable in this coin. It is plain, therefore, that unless the Treasury maintains silver dollars and silver certificates upon a gold basis, a large additional issue of bank notes might force us to a silver basis unless the silver certificates and silver dollars be retired from circulation, in addition to the retirement of the United States notes and Treasury notes.

The National Banking System was established in February, 1863, and for many years it has furnished a most excellent paper currency, secured by deposits of Government bonds with the Treasurer of the United States, and the bank notes are issued under such careful provisions of law that the general public scarcely realizes that they are simply promises to pay, and not actual money. The National Bank notes are redeemable in legal-tender notes, which, in turn, are redeemable in coin. The issue of currency by the Government and the restrictions upon National Banks, heretofore mentioned, have curtailed and reduced the volume of National Bank notes, and the provisions of the Bank Act, which prevent the redemption of more than $3,000,000 of bank notes during any one month, have also been a great disadvantage. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

National Banks for a number of years past have gradually become banks of deposit and discount, rather than banks of issue. This is the natural result of the Government's policy furnishing paper money, and of the restrictions imposed upon National Bank circulation rendering it unprofitable. While some plan providing for the issuance of unsecured bank notes, which would be a first lien upon the assets, a plan somewhat similar to the one now in operation in the Dominion of Canada, or proposed in some of the bills pending in Washington, might be devised that would make the holder comparatively safe, it would be an experiment, which, under existing circumstances might prove costly. Besides, with our present system in operation it is entirely unnecessary to make any radical change in the Bank Act.

The issuing of unsecured bank notes, making noteholders preferred creditors, would undoubtedly disturb depositors, and might cause a very considerable contraction, as bank checks are the principal circulating medium of the country. In times of panic unsecured bank notes would undoubtedly be presented in large amounts for redemption, thus causing heavy runs. This demand, in addition to withdrawal of deposits, would undoubtedly cause suspensions and great sacrifices on the part of the banks; whereas holders of bank notes secured by United States bonds, such as are now outstanding, are not called upon to take any action during a period of financial distress, as their money is not dependent upon the general assets of the bank—the issue department of National Banks being distinct from the banking department, upon practically the same principle as that of the Bank of England.

As the National Bank Act provides for the conversion of State banks into National banks, there would be no undue discrimination against State institutions, and if banks organized under the State laws desire to avail themselves of the privilege of issuing bank notes, it can be no hardship to them to convert themselves under the liberal provision of the law already made for that purpose. Indeed, it would appear that if State institutions should object to this course, they must consider the laws under which they are conducting their business as less restrictive than the National Bank Act, and it would certainly be inexpedient to permit banks to issue currency unless proper restrictions surrounded their business. Undoubtedly much of the excellence of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the National Banking System is due to the fact that it is conducted under the general laws of the United States, which insist upon formal report and examinations and provide for proper reserve against deposits.

It has been claimed by the advocates of the measures now pending in Congress, that bank notes issued freely without security further than a first lien upon the assets of the bank will be a more elastic currency and apt to be more readily retired, in case of redundancy, than it should under the National Bank Act. It is difficult to understand upon what premises this idea was based. There is no good reason why unsecured bank notes should be issued or retired more readily than secured notes.

From the foregoing it appears that the machinery of the National Banking System can be readily made available for the issuance of additional bank notes to replace the paper currency issued by the government, if the following modifications in the law are made:

First. Long-time bonds should be issued by the General Government to take up and cancel its paper money. These bonds can be utilized as security for bank notes.

Second. The tax of 1 per cent. per annum upon National bank circulation should be reduced to ¼ of 1 per cent. per annum.

Third. Banks should be permitted to issue notes to the extent of the par value of bonds deposited as security.*

Fourth. The restriction of the law providing that only $3,000,000 of National bank notes shall be redeemed in any one month should be repealed.

Fifth. In order to maintain gold payments the redemption fund deposited with the Treasurer of the United States should consist of gold coin or its equivalent.

Sixth. The Comptroller of the Currency should be authorized to have printed and continually on hand a sufficient amount of National Bank notes to supply the banks of the country with the maximum amount of circulation permitted by law upon a deposit of Government bonds.

Seventh. National Banks should be permitted to hold a portion of their reserves against deposits in the notes of other banks.

* The Comptroller of the Currency might be authorized to permit banks owning high-rate Government bonds, selling at a premium, to issue notes to substantially the market value of the bonds.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These modifications relate entirely to the issuing of bank notes, and do not disturb or weaken our banks, so far as their operations of deposit and discount are concerned.

In the solution of the currency situation, it is requisite that our entire system should be taken into account before any legislation bearing thereon is had, and no palliative measure should be adopted. The subject is of such vital importance to every one, to the humblest laborer as well as the richest capitalist, that in providing a remedy partisanship should be subordinated to statesmanship. The paper which has been issued by the Government is on a gold basis, and when supplanted by bank notes they also must be maintained upon a gold basis, and this must be done, even if we are compelled to make sacrifices to provide the necessary amount of gold coin for this purpose, for, whatever may be the opinion of the citizens of the United States in the matter, gold is to-day the sole money of full debt-paying power among the principal civilized nations.

H. W. CANNON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LITERATURE AND THE ENGLISH BOOK TRADE.

BY OUIDA.

I REMEMBER, a little while before the death in the hunting-field of that delightful companion and brilliant gentleman, Whyte Melville, a publisher said to me one day: "Ah! You know, if your books sold like Major Melville's we could afford to give you as long prices as we give to him." The publisher was not aware that I and Whyte Melville were friends. The latter, however, came to dine with me a few evenings later, and I told him what had been said. He stared, laughed, and pulled his long auburn moustache. "Well, by Jove! that's droll!" he said, with much amusement. "If the fellow didn't tell *me* last week that if my books sold like yours he could pay me double and treble!"

I have since been sceptical of all the utterances of the trade. They are just now, according to their own statements, almost *in extremis* in England. Accepting the declaration as a fact (which I do not, because every day there crops up some new publishing firm, which would not be the case if "publishing" spelt "ruin"), it is worth while to seek out the cause, or causes, which have led to the state of things which allows publishers to plead penury. As I have said, I do not believe in their poverty-stricken circumstances the least in the world, but what are the circumstances which enable such a *miserere* to be sung in chorus by them?

In the first place there are many too many of them in numbers, and in the second there are many too few of them who have any intellectual judgment. What should we think of a wine merchant who had no palate for wine? Yet the publisher is generally without any literary palate at all. Who is it who is responsible for all the trash and twaddle poured from the English and American printing-presses? The publisher clearly. If he were not ready and willing to be *accoucheur*, these wretched

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bantlings would never see the light. It is appalling to behold the amount of paper, ink, and typographical labor which is yearly wasted on bringing out works which should have been put on the fire, which should indeed never have been written at all. Take up any newspaper which publishes the announcements of books, and you will see twenty rubbishy volumes, which ought never to have occupied the time of compositors and binders, to one work of any ordinary interest and excellence. I asked a London publisher not long since why this ghastly amount of imbecile and ungrammatical works which see the light of type is ever issued. He answered me in these startling terms: "It does not matter very much whether a book is good or bad; if it be *new* a certain number will always be sold to the libraries, sufficient to pay the expense of bringing it out and leave us a certain margin of profit. When an author is celebrated, one has to pay him so much that he is rather a loss than otherwise; it is only when a writer of great talent does not know his value, *i. e.*, at the beginning of his career, that he is of any use to us, though of course his name always sets off our columns."

And although I am, as I have said, sceptical of the utterances of the trade, I do believe this; for in verification of the latter portion of the speech I call to mind the reply of another publisher, of whom I inquired if a certain sensational price attributed to him by the newspapers for a novel of a famous writer had really been paid, and who answered: "Yes, my house gave that, but we never saw it back again, nor one-half of it." For this reason the trade does cherish mediocrity, and worse than mediocrity, because out of these they get safe trade profits; small perhaps, but sure, because if a book be "new"—it may be rot—it will, nevertheless, be put in circulation. Abettor and aider of the publishers in thus thrusting rubbish down the throat of the public is the press, which almost invariably reviews this rubbish with patronizing amiability, when it ought, if it did its duty, not even to mention its existence.

The circulating libraries are, of course, als great factors in the demand for rubbish in the shape of books, for a demand there must be or there would not be so large a supply. The circulating libraries find that their readers require a large variety of books, and are, for the chief part, entirely indifferent to the quality of them,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only demanding the quantity. Therefore the libraries desire a continuous flow of new works. Now, it is of course obvious that of good books, books really worth being read, there are not a dozen, perhaps not half a dozen, in a year, whether of fiction or of *belles-lettres*. What can the librarian do? He must fill his boxes; he must respond to the lists sent by his clients; he could not persuade them, if he tried, to read what they call contemptuously "old books"; they will not read the same book twice, although if it be a fine book, whether a novel or not, it requires and deserves to be read several times.

He does not offer them works of twenty or fifty years ago, though they may never have read them; he must have for his clients what he calls "box-stuffers"—*i. e.*, any amount of trash so long as it is "new." He thus offers to the publishers their small but sure premium on the production of trash, and trash is multiplied like bacilli. The recent demand of the two great circulating libraries of England to be allowed to dictate the price of novels did not excite the attention which it ought to have done. For the consumer to dictate prices to the producer is not a way to improve trade. These two great libraries consider themselves in a position to do this, because they are, practically, the only buyers of books in Great Britain. They supply all the smaller circulating libraries, and, I believe, all the clubs and societies and institutions. They have an enormous power, and they consider that they have a right to use this power to insist on paying so much and no more. I imagine that if they choose to stand out, the publishers will yield to their demands. This attempt at dictation on their part has caused a great deal of nonsense to be written about the three-volume form of publishing novels. In these comments on the three-volume novel it is always assumed that the novel is of much greater length on account of the volumes to be filled by it than it would otherwise be. This is an entire mistake; *La Terre,* or *Le Nabab,* or *Le Moulin Frappier,* although only in one volume, are every whit as long as a three-volume novel, are indeed longer. It is the larger print of the three-volume form which spreads the matter over nine hundred odd pages. Writers of the press, treating of this subject, invariably say that to fill three volumes the writer draws out, by padding, a story naturally designed to fill only one. Now, if an author does do such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a horrible thing, he does not deserve to be in print at all. "Padding" is, as I understand this much-abused word, irrelevant matter injudiciously and inharmoniously introduced into a story to make it longer than it would naturally be. It is not conceivable that a writer of any genius, or even of any talent, would do anything of the sort. Inferior writers might do so, but then the whole of their work is padding, where it is not piracy. A writer of intellect and judgment knows, of course, that there are themes which require slight and suggestive treatment, and others which require long and elaborate development; he composes a short story or a long romance, according to the exigencies of his subject. I could not have stretched out *Pipistrello* or *The Dog of Flanders* into three volumes without ruin to them. I could not have compressed *Ariadne* or *Moths* into short stories without ruin to them. Every subject requires its own especial treatment and size of canvas, as does a picture. You do not paint a miniature on a six-foot wall, nor a fresco on a square inch of ivory.

The short story as opposed to the long romance is as the miniature to the fresco. They are entirely different to each other. I consider the short story much the more perfect as pure art. It is more concentrated, more delicate, more ideal; that is, when it is excellently well done, like *Boule de Suif*, like *Deux Rivales*, like *Yvette*, like the short stories of Paul Heyse, or those of Edmondo De Amicis. But the short story is only adapted to pathos; when humorous it is odious; and it never could replace the long romance if intricate events, complicated characters, or the portraiture of contemporary society is to be undertaken. Where would be *Vanity Fair* if reduced to the limits of a short story? I repeat I consider the short story is the most exquisite form of fiction, as the sonnet is of poetry; but the *Iliad* or the *Inferno*, the *Orlando* or *The Tempest*, could not be put into a sonnet, and no more could *Gil Blas* or *Waverley*, *Adam Bede* or *L'Impérieuse Bonté*, be put into a short story.

In France this is perfectly well known, and in Germany and in Italy, and even in Spain; but in England the idea that fiction is an art, and a very fine art, has been entirely stifled and obliterated under the deluge of trash, shot like rubbish from a dirt cart, which they dare to call literature. In no other country of Europe is there any such unmitigated rubbish poured

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out from the press as there is in England, and multiplied, as I have said, like microbes in gelatine. For the English mind is essentially inartistic, and only becomes artistic in its very higher forms when these become genius.

A critic has recently said that it would be well to abolish the long novel in England because all English readers invariably skip half that they have to read! These dear creatures would skip half a pamphlet as certainly as they would skip half a folio volume. The skipper of books is always a skipper, and had much rather play cricket, or darn stockings, than read any books at all. It is a fact that the English reader reads very loosely and indifferently, and when he or she reads fiction has a shame-faced puritanic kind of feeling that he is wasting his time. The average English reader has a vague confused memory that Hetty Sorel was seduced by Evan Harrington, that Mrs. Nickleby was Lady Dedlock, and that Pelham, after much tribulation, married Becky Sharp. "That beautiful book of yours," said an English reader to me the other day, "about a dog, you know; it was somewhere, I forget where, and had something dreadful done to it, and yet it served its master; I can't remember exactly, but it was beautiful and made me cry." I suppose she meant *Poussitte*.

This is the reader for whose enjoyment, and at whose request, the "box-stuffers" are produced. This is the reader who has brought about the state of things under which the English publishers are groaning. "Trade is bad," say these gentlemen; but the badness of trade ought to have nothing to do with literature. Short of a siege, like the siege of Paris, no external events ought to trouble the repose of the library. On the contrary the more disturbed, distressing, and unintellectual be the course of public events (as it is at the present hour), the more welcome should be the repose which the serenity of our books begets in us, and the welcome change of thought which they bring with them.

Nor can I see why the badness of other trades should affect the book trade in England, because books are so little bought there. Very cheap editions are the only forms on which the Briton spends his money; he likes something which he can leave behind him in the train without too much regret. Books are the things which English people, gentle and simple, can do without most easily. They read, also, in a muddle-headed kind of way. They read

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when they are tired, when they are traveling, when they are alone after dinner, and when they want to go to sleep. When they can do anything better or more amusing they seldom read. They have comical ideas, also, as to the composition of books. Writing seems to them similar to the treadmill. They cannot understand why, when a writer might be at Ascot or Hurlingham, or playing tennis or dining out, he should prefer instead to devote himself to the work he is creating. "It must take it out of you so," they will remark. Literary composition seems to them like taking a mud-bath or drinking Carlsbad waters—a thing which nobody would do if he were not obliged. That it can be the supreme joy and consolation and interest of a writer's life they would not believe if Tolstoi and Daudet and Loti and Mallock and Ibsen all swore it to them.

There is another matter in which, to my views, great libraries are as much at fault, even more so, as when they desire to dictate the prices of books. It is when they attempt to constitute themselves the censors of opinion, the judges of what the public should or should not read. It is as monstrous for a librarian, or a committee of librarians, to exclude a work which is asked for from their bookshelves, on the score of its immorality, as it would be for a grocer to refuse to sell a customer tea because he thought it bad for the nerves. The purveyor has no business to dictate the tastes of his supporters. The public is the sole judge of what it wishes to read. If the wickedest book in the world be in demand, the circulating libraries, which are merely the go-between, uniting the publisher and the reader, are bound to supply it. Its character is no affair of theirs. They are not Popes or police officers, nor is the public a child or a ward in Chancery.

I do not believe that the English book trade is affected by what is called the financial depression of the times; I believe it has gorged itself on its own trash, like the boa constrictor who lately swallowed its own blanket and died thereof. It suffers also from what every other trade suffers from in this century, the overcrowding of its ranks. What are wanted are a few great publishing-houses—a very few. Instead of what should be this choice few, there are scores of firms imbued with the same views of selling books as a grocer has of selling sugar and spice. Regarded merely as a trade, how far,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how very far, is the publishing trade of London removed from that of Paris! I contrast the cheapest French editions of my books with those of the cheapest English editions of them, the first so neat and simple in their glossy plain paper covers, with their good paper and admirable type within, and the second so atrocious in the gaudy pictorial cover, which is deemed needful to attract the eyes of the British multitude! Even in what is called the "Library Edition" (Heaven save the mark!) there are inferior type and inferior paper, in a rough red common cloth cover. Why cannot the French editions be imitated?

A long while ago I remember a London firm produced a cheap edition of Mrs. Gaskell's novels and those of others whose names I forget, in a charming pale lavender-grey paper cover (boards) solidly bound and stitched, and excellently printed. But I remember also that the publisher of it told me regretfully that it did not sell on the railway bookstalls, and that he had been obliged to substitute a vulgar cloth cover. What a melancholy picture of the literary taste of the British Isles!

I am informed that Mr. Morris's books are very beautifully printed and bound; I have not seen them, so cannot judge; but their prices are high, such as will only tempt bibliophiles. What is wanted in England are the cheap editions of books as well printed and turned out as such editions are in Paris. If the two great circulating libraries want to bring about a reform, they had better address themselves to this question, but, of course, they would not do so; cheap books, well turned out, would be the death-knell of their own industry; and it is not they who can be expected to teach the English nation to buy books. I fear the "box-stuffers" have a long life before them for this reason: that they are eminently useful to these great libraries.

Imagine if these great libraries had had nothing during the last six months to offer to their subscribers except George Meredith's *Lord Ormont*! And yet *Lord Ormont* is the only work of originality and note which the past six months have seen issued in London. But what would the subscribers say if, in return for their guinea, or their two or three guineas, they only received *Lord Ormont*, and again *Lord Ormont*, and yet again *Lord Ormont*, and nothing else? So the "box-stuffers" are hailed with open arms by the librarians, and *Lord Ormont* rubs sides with them on the bookshelves. Herein lies the real secret of the decline of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the book trade, and not in any reaction from the distress in other trades. "An open-air race which does not read" was the famous definition of the English race by Lord Beaconsfield; and in a great measure the definition is true. But it sometimes does wish to read, or it would not subscribe to the libraries; and it is a pity that it is obliged to accept the "box-stuffers" as mental pabulum.

The "box-stuffers" should cease to exist; no longer should the clever compositor toil for them, or paper be soiled for them, or newspapers be choked by worthless reviews of their worthless nonentities. The "box-stuffer" is to literature what the cad is to modern cities, and he should no longer degrade the art which he apes and injures. It is due to this intolerable pest that the great art of fiction is regarded as a mere pot-boiling profession by the English publishers and the English press.

In *éditions de luxe*, also, how far behind France is England! There is no bibliophile public to purchase in England such magnificent volumes as are published and eagerly bought in France. The fine artistic volumes of the great art publishers of Paris are sometimes imitated and brought out in a London garb, but they are no longer the same; their text is often mutilated, their illustrations ill copied, or ill printed when the original blocks are secured, and the binding is always utterly inferior. English purchasers are grudging of their money where books are concerned; and when an Englishman, noble or gentle, is in pecuniary difficulties, the first thing he sacrifices is his library.

Although there are still many Englishmen who buy from Mr. Quaritch and his fellow-collectors, there are many more who sell to him; and some great library or other goes to the hammer every season. There is no prince in England who sets the example of loving books, and spending nobly on them, which has been so long set in France by the Duc d'Aumale. Nor in the English nobility are there any such devoted patrons of books as are in France the Duc de Rivoli, the Duc de la Tremouille, the Marquis de Villantreys, the Marquis de Roys, the Baron Pichon, the Noailles, the d'Estrées, the Montmorencys, the d'Harcourt, and many others as illustrious. The first thing which the nobleman who is pressed for money sells is his library, as I have said, and the first thing the man of the middle classes, as the country squire, does when he is embarrassed, or obliged to retrench, is to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

give up his subscription to the circulating library and to tell his sons and daughters that they must buy no more books.

The late Duke of Albany had a very intelligent and tender love of books, and, had he lived, it is probable that his influence might have induced English society to care more for literature. But he died in his youth, and there is no one in his family who possesses either his taste or his culture. It is not on writers that a royal or imperial bibliophile and scholar could produce any effect: the writer is better away from the enervating and imprisoning atmosphere of any court; but on the reading public, or the public that does not read, such a prince might produce a grand effect, and he might set the example, as does the Duc d'Aumale, of preferring a lettered leisure to the foolish and restless gyrations and common-place pleasure so dear to most royal persons. But Leopold died with the violets on the Mediterranean shore, and in England the "box-stuffer" flourishes apace, and the book trade continues to destroy true literature, as the violets are pressed to death to serve the commerce of Bond street shops and distilleries in the Strand.

AUGUST, 1894. OUIDA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POLITICS AND THE FARMER.

BY THE HON. BEN. F. CLAYTON, PRESIDENT OF THE FARMERS' NATIONAL CONGRESS.

WE are confronted with the fact that every business interest of the country is under some kind of combination, and should be met by like combination on the part of the great producing classes; not with selfish and unreasonable demands, but by placing the Congress of the United States and the legislatures of the various States in possession of the necessary information required to protect and to build up the productive industries of the country.

As shown by the Census report of 1890, the farm values of the United States are as follows:

Farms and improvements	$13,279,252,649
Farm product, 1890	494,247,467
Live-stock	2,208,767,473
Farm implements and machinery	2,460,107,454
Grand total	$18,442,375,043

This gives agriculture in the United States about thirty per cent. of the entire wealth of the nation; and if we include the land interest, with all legitimately belonging to it, it amounts to fully sixty-six per cent. In discussing this question, the Secretary of Agriculture in his annual report truly says that the agricultural interest "represents thirty million people, or nearly one-half of our present population." He further says:

"It may be broadly stated that upon the productiveness of our agriculture, and upon the prosperity of our farmers, the entire wealth and prosperity of the whole nation depend."

And again:

"The trade and commerce of this vast country, of which we so proudly boast, the transportation facilities so wonderfully developed during the past quarter of a century, are all possible only because the underlying in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dustry of them all, agriculture, has called them into being. Even the products of our mines are valuable only because of the commerce and the wealth created by our agriculture. These are strong assertions, but they are assertions fully justified by the facts and recognized the world over by the highest authorities in political economy."

The farm is the true source of wealth to the people of the United States. The product of the soil, the raw material gathered from the field, the forest, and the mines, constitute the foundation upon which rest every occupation. From the farm, the people engaged in mechanical pursuits, in the arts, or in the varied professions must be fed, clothed, and warmed. The vast and various resources of the farm have called into being every art that adorns every useful invention and every science that enlarges the boundary of our field of knowledge. The transportation of the tremendous quantity of farm product has called into existence the railway system, into activity the ocean steamers that sail upon every sea and to every known market. For manufacturing its material there have been erected establishments whose smoke darkens every sky. Its product furnishes employment to labor, and life and activity to our great commercial centres. American agriculture, standing in the breach between great contending forces, the friend of law, of order, and of all occupations, becomes the impartial arbiter between the discordant elements of society, and is the first to feel the shock of financial disaster and commercial depression.

The great political revolution of 1892, with its threatened change of governmental policy relating to the industrial interests of the country is, it is alleged, the cause of the late business prostration. In verification of this we quote from most eminent authority.

President Harrison, in his message to Congress in 1892, says :

"That the general conditions affecting the commercial and industrial interests of the United States are in the highest degree favorable; that there has never been a time in our history when work was so abundant or when wages were so high."

President Cleveland, eight months later, in the face of crop prospects the magnitude of which had seldom been seen, in his proclamation convening the extra session of Congress, said :

"That distrust and apprehension concerning the financial situation which pervades all business circles have already caused great loss and damage to our people, and threaten to cripple our merchants, stop the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wheels of manufacture, bring distress and privation to our farmers, and withhold from our workingmen the wage of labor."

In his message to the extra session of Congress, he said :

"With plenteous crops, with abundant promise of remunerative production and manufacture, with unusual invitation to safe investment, and with satisfactory assurance to business enterprise, suddenly financial fear and distrust have sprung up on every side, values supposed to be fixed are fast becoming conjectural, and loss and failure have involved every branch of business."

These two pictures, drawn by master artists—the leaders of the two great political parties—were a true representation of the condition of the business of the country at that time. That of General Harrison was at the close of more than thirty years of practical operation of a policy under which the wealth of the nation had increased from $16,159,616,068 in 1860 to $62,610,000,000 in 1890, notwithstanding the loss of some $10,000,000,000 during the war. The condition of the country, as portrayed by Mr. Cleveland, is equally true, and could have been brought about only by the threatened change of a long-established policy. As soon as it was demonstrated that the new administration was in a position to make good the promises of its so-called reform on certain lines, without waiting for the actual repeal of existing laws, capital became uneasy, deposits were withdrawn from banks, money went into hiding-places in lieu of investment, merchants purchased with caution; factories scaled in time and wages or put out their fires; railways brought to bear the most rigid retrenchment in labor and in expenditure; mines were closed, business-houses suspended, banks ruined, laboring men thrown out of employment, strikes ordered, and the home market for farm products was destroyed. Nor has the substance of the foreshadowed "reform" revived the prostrated industries, as its friends anticipated it would.

A review of the present Congress and the occupation of its members will relieve farmers of responsibility for disastrous legislation. The biography of the Fifty-third Congress, furnished by its members, discloses the fact that out of a membership of four hundred and forty-four the farmers have thirty-five in the House of Representatives and one in the Senate; that the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate comes from an obscure State as to agricultural resources and records himself as an attorney, the only farmer on the committee being from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a homestead in North Dakota. Ten of the eighteen comprising the House Committee, including the Chairman, follow the law as a profession. The great States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Missouri have each one farmer; and the heart of the great agricultural region—Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa—have no farmer in either branch of Congress. The only chairmanship controlled by the agricultural members of the House is that of the Committee on "Ventilation and Acoustics"; otherwise the farmers of the House are practically disfranchised. This is contrary to the eternal fitness of things, and yet it is about the average representation accorded to the productive industries of the country throughout the history of the American Republic.

Neither of the two great political parties are to blame for this condition of things; the fault lies at the door of the farmer, and is a sad comment on the agricultural voter. His mistake is in not being at the caucus or the primary of the political party to which he belongs; in not recognizing the fact that when the local caucus adjourns, the doors are closed, he is in honor bound to support the candidate and to accept the situation. He has no redress except to bolt the ticket of his party. He should have spent the short time required, once or twice each year, in securing a good farmer, merchant, or professional man to represent him in the higher councils of his party.

It is granted that labor has equal right with capital to organize, but the right of either or any organization to disturb or to destroy the business interest of the country is denied. Past experience with both of these elements, for the last eighteen months, leads us to the conclusion that we have reached the time for Congressional intervention in order to check rash movements, and that they should be enjoined from interfering with traffic until proper investigation is obtained. While the price of farm product is largely governed by supply and demand, yet there is no business so sensitive to spasmodic action of capital or labor. The clogging of the channel of trade is disastrous, nor is railway rate war of practical benefit to the farmer and the shipper of live-stock but often a damage in producing unsettled and overflowed markets, which always follow cut rates. Labor strikes not only deprive men of employment and lessen their ability to purchase the necessaries of life, but they retard the regular flow of farm

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

product to the markets. These being largely perishable, heavy loss is the result, and what is not perishable rapidly accumulates to be thrown on the market in such quantities as to create seriously decreased prices.

Representing a large per cent. of the population of the entire country, any organization to which the farming element would be loyal could approach the Congress of the United States with great confidence of success in securing a respectful hearing. The greatest, and, in fact, the only difficulty in the way, is the problem of maintaining such an organization. Not because of a want of intelligence, for the best brain of the nation has come from the farm; but because the financial conditions of the farming class are so varied, and the farmers are so evenly distributed throughout the rural districts, that a concentration of power cannot be accomplished so uniformly and harmoniously as with other great interests.

Farmer organizations in the past have been a flat failure. They have been manipulated in the interest of political parties and to advance the interests of political leaders. The Grange organization of the early seventies was a magnificent effort in the right direction. As long as it adhered to the object for which it was organized, it commanded the respect of the leading political parties, but when it entered the muddy pool of politics it soon lost its power for good. The Farmers' Alliance, which took the place of the Grange, was soon wrecked on the same political reef. These failures have caused thoughtful and practical representative men of the great productive interests of the country to look in a different direction for necessary influence to secure legislation in behalf of our great interest. It is through the non-political action of the "Farmers' National Congress of the United States of America" that much has been accomplished, and through which much more may be accomplished.

The principles of this organization are contained in one short sentence of the first section of the Constitution, which says: "Its object shall be to advance the agricultural interest of the Union." The organization is non-political in character, with the same representation as the Congress of the United States, with the addition that the presidents of all State agricultural societies and agricultural colleges are members by virtue of their offices. The delegates, who hold office for two years, are ap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pointed and commissioned by the Governors of the several States. The object of the organization is two-fold in character. First: It seeks to mould and shape such legislation as the interest of the farmer requires, and to present it to State and national legislative bodies for their action. Second: It has a literary programme by which it seeks to elevate the great masses now engaged in agricultural pursuits to a position in keeping with that occupation.

Annual meetings have been held in St. Louis, Chicago, Indianapolis, Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, St. Paul, Washington, Topeka, Montgomery, Council Bluffs, Lincoln, Savannah, and at Parkersburg, West Va. At each of these sessions resolutions have been adopted asking for such legislation as the productive interest of the country requires. These resolutions have been sent to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, and have been printed and placed upon the desk of every member of Congress.

Nearly every important demand made by this Congress upon our national legislative body has been favorably considered. It demanded the passage of the Interstate Commerce law; it demanded that the Secretary of Agriculture be made a cabinet officer; that the Signal Service be enlarged; that infectious disease of live-stock be stamped out; that adulteration of human food be prevented; that our rivers and harbors be improved; that the irrigation of the arid districts be encouraged; and that agricultural products be given the benefit of the same protective policy extended by the government to other great interests.

The fact of the Farmers' National Congress being non-political in its character does not preclude the discussion of political questions. Directly or indirectly all questions demanding legislation affect the productive industries, and they are to be discussed freely, fairly, and impartially. The Governors of the several States have been prompt in their appointment of representative men from every branch of that industry as delegates; and the literary programmes, prepared three months in advance of each meeting, have been carried out by splendid speakers and writers, many of whom have a national reputation. The organization has been a gradual growth until it has become permanent, and its influence with the Government at Washington is second to that of no other.

BEN. F. CLAYTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW PULPIT.

BY THE REV. H. R. HAWEIS, M. A.

I.

Does it exist?

It is always best to declare, concerning anything desirable, that it already exists. As prophecy often brings its own fulfilment, so assertion will often create a fact. The man who believes in the mind cure and denies pain is not unfrequently rewarded.

Now, we want a New Pulpit; the laity intends to get a New Pulpit, and, what is more, a New Pulpit is on its way.

The Early Christian Pulpit of Clement, Polycarp, and Ignatius was kept alive with the personal recollections of Jesus Christ. "*I*," as Polycarp used to say, "*who have seen the Apostles.*"

The Mediæval Pulpit lived on church ceremonials and the lives of the saints; the Reformation Pulpit lived on the Bible, chiefly seen through the eyes of Luther. But what does the Modern Pulpit live upon? Doctrinally, on the dried pippins of the past! It has nothing distinctive. Its methods are a mixture—"The mixture as before."

"Well, but," asks the anxious inquirer, "what can you want more—if you are a Christian—than the life of Christ, the organization of worship, the records of saintly lives and the study of the Bible—is not that enough for the pulpit?"—which sounds very well until you come to ask one question—"How does the modern pulpit deal with all this material? As Hamlet says, "*the readiness is all!*"

II.

Now, I do not think, with some lively journalists, that in the near future the sermon is to be crowded out by the leading article—facts point in another direction. Indeed, I am glad to see

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sermons habitually reproduced in the American papers on Monday and commented upon on Tuesday. This does not mean the extinction of the pulpit by the Press, but the affiliation of the Press to the Pulpit. Here, as elsewhere, America leads the way. The New Pulpit is already alive over there; that is why the Press is busy with it. It has hardly begun to be thought of over here; that is why the newspapers, as a rule, pay no more attention to our Sunday sermons than to the debates in Convocation—the improbability of anything of interest or importance being said in either case is too great.

III.

It may be asked what I mean by the NEW PULPIT.

A pulpit in touch with the life of the period. A pulpit up to date; interested in what is interesting; capable of refocusing religion; quick to note when a phrase is outworn; resolved to find why clever men won't listen to sermons; convinced that every pursuit, occupation, discovery, and faculty of man should have a moral thrust and prepared to give it. A pulpit of this kind has little to fear, but something to learn, from leading articles. The Press can never be the Preacher's master, but it may and should be his indicator; let him keep his finger upon its pulse if he would play upon the hearts of his people.

IV.

Sermons will never be crowded out by the Press so long as the people crowd in to the preacher. The old pulpit not only will be, it has been, superseded—it is stricken with dogmatic ague, it is palsied with fear; it would persecute if it could, but it can't, for it has ceased to inspire convictions worth persecuting. The New Pulpit has nothing to fear except a certain timidity and distrust which eyes all novelty askance—as those who taste a new food turn away, yet soon after maybe ready to fall on it ravenously.

V.

Between the old and the New Pulpit stands the Transition Pulpit, just as between Moses and Christ stood the Talmud; and between Mohammed and the New World stand the elaborate commentaries and traditions of Islamism. Were it not for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Transition Pulpit no one would ever listen to sermons. No one could sit through a Tillotson, a Barrow, or even a Simeon, or a Wesley now. A Latimer, a South, or a Sterne might get a partial hearing—not because of the doctrine, or the once much admired form, but on account of the wit.

Things move apace. It is strange to think how only some twenty years ago in our high churches, St. Paul's at Brighton for instance, a short-sighted gentleman, with a MS. held close to his nose, would get off such sentences as "our Holy Mother the Church, whose blessed decrees we are bound to submit to, commands us this day to bow in thankful adoration in memory of the Holy Innocents, who were slain at Bethlehem. The blessed Cyprian, etc., etc.," and so on for about twenty minutes and not more.

This sort of thing received its *quietus* with the appearance of Dr. Liddon, who was never under the hour. Whilst pinning his faith to the old theological watchwords, and attributing an extreme importance to the utterances of the blessed Cyprians, Chrysostoms, and other religious antiquaries—great lights in their own day—Dr. Liddon brought such a wealth of illustration to bear upon his subject, and affected such a familiarity with current 'ologies and sciences, that his listeners almost forgot the patristic anacronisms in the nervous rhetoric and philosophical flavor of the nineteenth century.

VI.

Liddon was a transition HIGH CHURCH preacher.

Only about forty years ago Hell-fire was still the favorite and apparently ever-enjoyable theme in most LOW CHURCH pulpits. This was the sinner's appropriate doom; and the forensic substitution of the Saviour's merits, and acceptance of the same by the believer—this was the easy, if somewhat mechanical, deliverance announced, with almost demonstrative precision. Mr. Spurgeon, prince of so-called evangelical or Low Church preachers, began stoutly with these two dogmatic "battle-horses"; but whilst sticking to them, as Liddon stuck to the fathers, the wealth of anecdote, the pungency of wit, and the quaint personal applications made his hearers almost forget the dying dogmas upon which he certainly, with an orator's true instinct of current feeling, harped less and less the longer he lived.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VII.

The great transitionist preacher of the more liberal or so-called BROAD CHURCH school was W. F. Robertson, of Brighton. He stuck very closely to the Bible, and thought it his duty to present, in some form or other, what are called the cardinal doctrines of the Christian religion, all of them singularly absent from the sermon on the mount, *e. g.*, eternal punishment, the divinity of our Lord, the inspiration of the Bible, justification by faith, baptismal regeneration, and so forth. Nothing is left out or ignored in Robertson's precious, though fragmentary, volumes. But what goes home in Robertson's teaching, what made his sermons so instantly popular throughout America, was their *modernity*. Their poetry, their sympathy, their extreme clearness, nothing of the past sacred because of the past—only because of the present. "Act, act in the living present, heart within and God o'erhead."

IX.

"Your criticism is too destructive," says the Pew. "You take away the subject-matter of High, Low, and Broad Church doctrine, with a chance remark that it is not to be found in the sermon on the mount, and what is left for the New Pulpit?"

Let me not be mistaken. Because many doctrines, evolved by the church, and put forward as essential to Christianity, are not to be found in the direct teaching of Christ, it does not follow that they are not true, or that the dogma, which once enshrined, but now obscures, them, does not hold in suspension a certain amount of true teaching or "Doctrine." It is the business of the New Pulpit steadily to deliver theology from the exploded watchwords, which, like "the blessed word Mesopotamia," lull the listener to sleep, in order that living doctrine may come out of dead dogma. We must never forget that what is now dead dogma was once living doctrine—*it was the likeliest statement*—what seemed most true at the time. It is not clear statement that we renounce—but riveting the form of statement suitable to one age upon all succeeding ages.

For instance, the Old Pulpit said, "The Bible is the word of God."

The New Pulpit says, "*The word of God is in the Bible.*"

The Old Pulpit said, "The Bible is an inspired history."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Pulpit says, "*The Bible is the history of an inspired people.*"

The Old Pulpit said, "The Bible is infallibly inspired."

The New Pulpit says, "*The Bible is inspired, but not infallible.*"

The Old Pulpit said, "I believe in the resurrection of the body."

The New Pulpit adds, "*I believe in the survival of the ego and the continuity of the individual in some suitable, though at present unknown, form*, under some suitable, though at present, unknown conditions, and so forth.''

This is not a theological article. It aims rather at defining the historical position and prospects of the modern pulpit and indicating the conditions of its vitality.

The first and foremost need is re-statement up to date; the grand Maurician recognition that never a dogma so dead but what it stands for a vital truth. Disengage the truth, reset, restate the truth, give it currency once more.

Take up every one of these orthodox dogmas, and in the very process of saying "they *were* true," "they *are* true, they are *no longer* true," the light long obscured will begin to shine out of them like a mortuary lamp from the darkness of the sepulchre. If the preachers throughout Christendom will take up the gospel of re-statement alone, they will have their work cut out for them, and their reassuring text should be, "*We come not to destroy, but to fulfil.*"

X.

In all this there is nothing new; every few hundred years all forms have to be revised—in law, in politics, in science—and all expressions of truth have to be modified.

The church is not a building. Neither the Temple at Jerusalem, nor St. Peter's at Rome is final. The church is a vine—a living, growing vine—it is always outgrowing outself.

The Christianity of the Apostles is no longer quite Christ. The fathers are not quite Apostolic. The schoolmen are far away from the fathers whilst building their sepulchres. The later Mediæval, I had almost said *Medicean*, church is already distinct from the schoolmen. Luther breaks with the Pope. We are on the point of breaking with Luther—if we have not already done

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so. With Calvin we have quite broken. And so, in its outward form and expression, it is true of Christianity as of all things in heaven and earth, and in the waters under the earth—"The old order changeth, making place for new, and God fulfils Himself in many ways"—or, as the Apostle has it: "He taketh away the old, that He may establish the new."

Truly, the New Pulpit has its work cut out for it.

XI.

When the New Pulpit has succeeded in re-stating what it believes, it will be in a position to tell people how to act. But the preacher cannot do that, unless he knows what modern life is. It won't do to pride himself on never reading any books, as some of the High Church clergy do, or upon never going to any entertainments, as some of the Low Church clergy do. The pulpit teacher who undertakes to show that the world was made in six days is quite as much out of the New Pulpit as the pastor who thinks young people should not dance, and that all theatres are sinks of iniquity.

The first thing is to see life as it is, things as they are; and to burn the men of straw and other stage properties of the Old Pulpit. When a clergyman gets into the pulpit he too often seems to enter an unreal world, and a very silly unreal world. He is content with argument which any schoolboy can see through, and utters sentiments, the inconsequence or inanity of which he would not expect any human being to tolerate from him on his own hearth-rug.

XII.

A great deal of superannuated nonsense is talked about *preaching the Gospel*. There is no age which does not find fault with the past age; there is no sect which does not find fault with every other sect, for not *preaching the Gospel*: and I never yet knew an able minister who could fill his church, who was not denounced by the ass across the way whose church was empty, for not *preaching the Gospel*.

There is only one way of preaching the Gospel as Christ preached it, and that is to make teaching cling close to, deal with, and control current life.

The relations between a clever swindler and his employer, a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

woman plying her broom diligently, a clamorous widow worrying a police magistrate, the children in the street playing their vulgar little games and singing their vulgar little songs, the processes of digestion, the weather (that inexhaustible and invariably interesting topic), the occupations of Hodge, the secrets of fishing, the art of making bread or bottling wine—these were the topics of the Divine Preacher.

The religious world of the period thought them very much beneath the dignity of the pulpit, but the hungry sheep who looked up and wanted to be fed were "*very attentive to hear*" about all this. It was indeed a New Pulpit, with not much about Moses or the prophets left in it; the old Shibboleths were quietly dropped out. This seemed to please the people mightily, but it disgusted the accredited teachers who dealt with nothing but texts and eternal explanations of texts, all the time neglecting "weightier matters." As Lord Brougham said of the schoolmasters of his period, "*They were failures themselves, and they taught failure.*"

XIII.

But how can you teach without a body of sound doctrine? No one supposes that Christ was not armed with a body of doctrine—that He did not come with a message from above; but the doctrine in His method was not held up like a jingling bauble and shaken outside a man to terrify or astonish; it was woven into very fibre of man's heart and melted into every experience of his life. I am sick of such silly clap-trap as "Politics in the pulpit? O fie! What has the pulpit to do with politics?" Why, so long as politics have got to do with the excesses of party spirit, so long as men are bought and sold in our political shambles like brute beasts that have no understanding (let alone morals), so long as the country's good name is prostituted and the interests of millions bartered for messes of private pottage, the pulpit must have to do with politics—or be impeached by all good men for its scandalous reticence.

What has the Pulpit got to do with commerce? What has commerce got to do with *meum* and *tuum*? with rings of capitalists banded together outside the control of the law, to perpetrate jobs and create monopolies, ruining legitimate industry and forcing on strikes, fit to tar and feather a free constitution with ignominy, whilst hurrying city after city into rapine and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

murder? God help the preachers if they have nothing to say about commerce. Of such let it be written: "They are all dumb dogs: they cannot bark."

XIV.

And what has the Pulpit to say to the stage?

"*Retro Satanas!*" Is that all? Or, "You go your way; I go mine"? That is better, but not good enough. It may be quite true that the green-room is no more the place for the cleric than the church vestry is for the actor; but that is not because the vestry is all holy and the green-room is all corrupt, but because the stage player's and the preacher's functions are distinct, although at moments they may overlap. We do not seek for lawyers in hospitals or doctors in law courts, but there may come occasions when a doctor may have to give evidence in a law court, when the case impinges on his special business; and there may come times when the preacher may have to bear witness in the pulpit for or against a stage play, when the moral plane is impinged upon and ideals of conduct are dealt with or betrayed for better or for worse. The late Frederick Denison Maurice, although no friend of the stage as it existed in his day, nevertheless said that when Macready produced "*Ton,*" a play of high and noble tendency, the London clergy ought to have put on their largest white ties and sat in the pit. If the clergy want their strictures on the stage to take effect—and there is almost as much to mend in the administration of the stage as there is in the administration of the church—they should at least take care to know something about the stage and its modern professors.

After listening the other day to the wholesale denunciation of the theatre by an elderly and altogether well-meaning clergyman, I asked him when he came down from the pulpit if he had ever been to the the theatre or knew an actor. "God forbid!" said the good man.

Still, I confess to a distrust of this new alliance between parsons and ballet-girls, and all this clerical extolling of the antics of the dance; not because ballet-girls may not be respectable people and dancing a very legitimate art, but because it is not the province of the clergy to consort ostentatiously with ladies of the ballet or to pose as votaries of Terpsichore, any more than it is the business of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the lawyer to superintend cooking or calisthenics. I have personally a sort of prejudice against church and stage guilds. I love a good play and am honored with the friendship of several of our foremost actors. I have been at their theatres and they have been at my church, but there is something to me priggish in singling them out as a class—why not a Church and Sculptors Guild or a Church and Costers Guild? Let people come to church to worship, and let them go to the theatre to laugh or cry or recreate their minds. By all means let the church supply the actor with wholesome guidance, a lift in conduct, and an aspiration in life; an escape from a too sordid realism into a spiritual ideal. May the stage meet a legitimate want and become, not only a recreation, but a comfort and a safety-valve. But the parson has no more business to condescend to the actor than the actor has to truckle to the parson. Let them meet as men and brothers, each laboring as best he can in his own vocation—on parallel, not antagonistic, planes. But the moment you have a Church and Stage Guild, each has something up his sleeve, and each knows it. As men and brethren their intercourse may be natural, unaffected, and delightful. As members of a guild they become self-conscious, and the charm and sincerity of social intercourse die. The parson enters on his high horse and the actor rolls in on his hobby, and as they meet and shake hands the parson's aside is "*You're not good enough for me,*" and the actor's aside is "*You're not clever enough for me.*"

But, whatever view may be taken of the situation, one thing is quite certain: that if the parson will not reckon with the play-actor, the play-actor intends to reckon with the parson. Parsons brought before the footlights are now quite common, and no high-class drama is complete without two or three little sermons, generally in the mouth of a frail lady; and these things are written for our learning.

XV.

And what has the Pulpit got to do with books and newspapers? Why, the Pulpit should have something to say about every novel that has a run, from *Robert Elsmere* to *Dodo*. Neither the half-truth of the one nor the cynicism of the other should pass unexposed or unrebuked.

When Robert Louis Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appeared—the twin personalities of good and evil wrought out in one man—every pulpit in the land ought to have seized on so fruitful a theme, at a moment when the genius of a novelist and a real seer had made the air electric.

XVI.

Again, the New Pulpit has its work cut out for it if it will enter the lists with journalism. Every day disputable articles, and articles dangerous to morality, or requiring ethical reply, or indicating new currents of moral or religious life, pass unnoticed and unpreached on, greatly to the detriment of the pew and the impoverishment of the pulpit. But it is just the thoughts and discussions of the week-day that cry aloud for some Sunday comment.

Can't the clergy point out the moral thrust of this or that *cause célèbre*—the iniquity of this *suppressio veri*—the immorality of this or that political dodge or double shuffle—the unjustifiable character of such and such filthy report, or dubious paragraph, or semi-libellous class of statement, which is not intended even to convey information—only to sell an edition ?

I venture to say that Jesus would not have allowed these things to pass unchallenged in the streets and offices of Jerusalem.

XVII.

This is an age of science, and a pulpit that ignores science must run the risk of being itself ignored.

How came it about for instance that preachers, almost to a man, missed the turn of the tide when the stream of materialism, after rolling on towards the cataract of despair, seemed about to plunge into the yawning Gulf of Atheism, but was suddenly checked and diverted by a sentence in Professor Tyndall's famous address at Glasgow, which, after all, only embodied a scientific confession that had to be made sooner or later, viz., that the universe and its order could not be accounted for by matter and force alone, as usually conceived, but, as Büchner has it, by matter and force + x? "Before," said Tyndall, "you can find the promise and potency of all life in matter, you must radically change your conception of matter, and then, etc., etc.," all would go swimmingly. "You must," added G. H. Lewes, "have matter and force specially determined under peculiar and complex relations." Here

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was the preacher's opportunity. Instead of twaddling on about Genesis and the six days, or denouncing men of science as Atheists and their research as dangerous, the preachers should have risen in their pulpits throughout the country, and sung a pæan on the scientific collapse of raw materialism. "Pray, how," they should have cried, "can you slip in 'special determination and peculiar and complex relations' without having slipped in 'mind' or 'purpose' in the earlier stages? My friends, do you not see it is the old hat trick, a cornucopia of wealth? You simply put into the scientist hat what you want to get out of it, and 'Evolution' *le voilà*!" But, no! Tyndall's address fell on deaf ears, the clergy not knowing, as usual, the things which belonged to their peace.

The New Pulpit has to watch, not only the progress, the discoveries, the dogmatisms, and the assumptions, but also the confessions of science. Indeed, as Lord Salisbury pointed out lately at the British Association, what science does not know and can't do is quite as instructive as its triumphs and its truths; only he forgot to encourage the New Pulpit to take up the parable, and would possibly have been shocked at such a recommendation.

XVIII.

Lastly—Science and Occultism. What has the pulpit to say to such a combination? As to occultism, abject incredulity or rabid denunciation seems for the mass of the clergy the only alternative, and both are equally out of place at this time of day. Ah! when shall we find in the pulpit the judicial spirit of an Oliver Lodge or a W. Crookes?

At the fag end of a paper like this it is impossible to discuss adequately the present attitude of the pulpit towards Spiritualism, Theosophy, Christian Science, and other modern nineteenth century forms of the occult; but the complacent doctrine that sundry abnormal things occurred as related in old Jewish annals, and even as late as the first thirty-three years of the Christian era, and for perhaps a few years later—but outside those limits all phenomena of a similar kind never occurred at all—is a theory which only belongs to the theological bigot; whilst the scientific bigot, with a dogmatism almost as *naïve*, makes a clean sweep of all abnormal phenomena whatever, both in and out of the Bible.

It is the old story. When facts are against orthodox science or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

religion, so much the worse for facts; but such methods can have no place in the New Pulpit—which will certainly maintain that whatever God Almighty has permitted to be true in history cannot really be opposed to any other kind of truth.

XIX.

What a sphere there is open to the preacher of the coming day! He may not be a politician, but he hunts politicians; nor an expert in dancing, but he knows when dancing is devilish; nor a playwright, but he can tell a good play from a bad; nor a novelist, but he judges the tendency of fiction; nor a man of science, but he estimates the importance of scientific discovery to moral order, and he ought to arrive at some conclusion about its relation to the occult, for it must be a matter of supreme interest to him and to everybody else, whether or not in these days a possibility, a hope, or even a faith in a life after death is ever to be converted into a scientific certainty.

XX.

Amongst the discoveries of this marvelous age—and an age of miracles could hardly be more staggering—not the least noteworthy would be the establishment, on scientific grounds, of the survival, if not the immortality, of the soul. Mr. Stead, we all know, looks hopefully, in spite of numerous failures and still more numerous frauds, to spirit-photography. But that is only one method of possible demonstration, and the sifting of strange evidence in a dozen different, but converging, directions is going on apace all round us.

XXI.

If only the Preacher knew it, the whole worlds belongs to him. The time is past when he need knot his discourse with texts. If he leaves a few out no one will miss them, any more than Bible readers notice the entire omission of the word "God" in the book of Esther.

If, for a little while only, the pulpiteer would cease to drag about the familiar dogmas, shout the old watchwords, demolish the poor man of straw and pound the infidel, people would be so grateful; and even the infidel, who is often only the truth-seeker in disguise, might come to church. What we now want in the Pulpit is freedom, range, sincerity, and common-sense—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the spirit of a thousand texts without the recitation and set explanation of one—the divine life not copied by, but applied to and absorbed into, the Nineteenth Century.

XXII.

The Christ at Chicago or in London would probably not look much like the Christ of Palestine, and would certainly not adopt the methods or the rabbinical forms of teaching, or the costume or the customs familiar to, and suitable to, the people of His day —but the New Pulpit should stand for the freedom of Christ's utterance, the reach of His sympathy, and that discernment of the signs of the times without which no ministry can be prophetical and no pulpit alive. The age waits. There is only one man who, whatever estimate we may have formed of him personally, has ever approximately grasped the true functions of the New Pulpit, and that man was Henry Ward Beecher.

H. R. Haweis.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECOLLECTIONS OF ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON.

BY ANDREW LANG.

BEFORE attempting to give any "Reminiscences" of Mr. Stevenson, it is right to observe that reminiscences of him can best be found in his own works. In his essay on *Child's Play*, and in his *Child's Garden of Verse*, he gave to the world his vivid recollections of his imaginative infancy. In other essays he spoke of his boyhood, his health, his dreams, his methods of work and study. *The Silverado Squatters* reveals part of his experience in America. The Parisian scenes in *The Wrecker* are inspired by his sojourn in French Bohemia; his journeys are recorded in *Travels with a Donkey* and *An Inland Voyage*, while his South Sea sketches, which appeared in periodicals, deal with his Oceanic adventures. He was the most autobiographical of authors, with an egoism nearly as complete, and to us as delightful, as the egoism of Montaigne. Thus, the proper sources of information about the author of *Kidnapped* are in his delightful books.

"John's own John," as Dr. Holmes says, may be very unlike his neighbor's John; but in the case of Mr. Stevenson, his Louis was very similar to my Louis; I mean that, as he presents his personality to the world in his writings, even so did that personality appear to me in our intercourse. The man I knew was always a boy.

"Sing me a song of the lad that is gone,"

he wrote about Prince Charlie, but in his own case the lad was never "gone." Like Keats and Shelley, he was, and he looked, of the immortally young. He and I were at school together, but I was an elderly boy of seventeen, when he was lost in the crowd of "gytes," as the members of the lowest form are called. Like

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all Scotch people, we had a vague family connection ; a great-uncle of his, I fancy, married an aunt of my own, called, for her beauty, "The Flower of Ettrick." So we had both heard ; but these things were before our day. A lady of my kindred remembers carrying Stevenson about when he was "a rather peevish baby," and I have seen a beautiful photograph of him, like one of Raffael's children, taken when his years were three or four. But I never had heard of his existence till, in 1873, I think, I was at Mentone, in the interests of my health. Here I met Mr. Sidney Colvin, now of the British Museum, and, with Mr. Colvin, Stevenson. He looked as, in my eyes, he always did look, more like a lass than a lad, with a rather long, smooth oval face, brown hair worn at greater length than is common, large lucid eyes, but whether blue or brown I cannot remember, if brown, certainly light brown. On appealing to the authority of a lady, I learn that brown *was* the hue. His color was a trifle hectic, as is not unusual at Mentone, but he seemed, under his big blue cloak, to be of slender, yet agile frame. He was like nobody else whom I ever met. There was a sort of uncommon celerity in changing expression, in thought and speech. His cloak and Tyrolese hat (he would admit the innocent impeachment) were decidedly dear to him. On the frontier of Italy, why should he not do as the Italians do? It would have been well for me, if I could have imitated the wearing of the cloak!

I shall not deny that my first impression was not wholly favorable. "Here," I thought, "is one of your æsthetic young men, though a very clever one." What the talk was about, I do not remember ; probably of books. Mr. Stevenson afterwards told me that I had spoken of Monsieur Paul de St. Victor, as a fine writer, but added that "he was not a British sportsman." Mr. Stevenson himself, to my surprise, was unable to walk beyond a very short distance, and, as it soon appeared, he thought his thread of life was nearly spun. He had just written his essay, *Ordered South*, the first of his published works, for his *Pentland Rising* pamphlet was unknown, a boy's performance. On reading *Ordered South*, I saw, at once, that here was a new writer, a writer indeed ; one who could do what none of us, *nous autres*, could rival, or approach. I was instantly "sealed of the Tribe of Louis," an admirer, a devotee, a fanatic, if you please. At least my taste has never altered. From this essay it is plain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough that the author (as is so common in youth, but with better reason than many have) thought himself doomed. Most of us have gone through that, the Millevoye phrase, but who else has shown such a wise and gay acceptance of the apparently inevitable? We parted; I remember little of our converse, except a shrewd and hearty piece of encouragement given me by my junior, who already knew so much more of life than his senior will ever do. For he ran forth to embrace life like a lover: *his* motto was never Lucy Ashton's—

> "Vacant heart, and hand, and eye,
> Easy live and quiet die."

Mr. Stevenson came presently to visit me at Oxford. I make no hand of reminiscences; I remember nothing about what we did or said, with one exception, which is not going to be published. I heard of him, writing essays in the *Portfolio* and the *Cornhill*, those delightful views of life at twenty-five, so brave, so real, so vivid, so wise, so exquisite, which all should know, which I could not re-read just now. How we looked for "R. L. S." at the end of an article, and how devout was our belief, how happy our pride, in the young one!

About 1878, I think (I was now a slave of the quill myself), I received a brief note from Mr. Stevenson, introducing to me the person whom, in his essay on his old college magazine, he called "Glasgow Browne." What his real name was, whence he came, whence the money came, I never knew. G. B. was going to start a weekly paper. Would I contribute? G. B. came to see me. Mr. Stevenson has described him, *not* as I would have described him. He was "not my sort," and, like Mr. Bill Sikes's dog, I have the Christian peculiarity of not liking dogs "as are not of my breed." G. B.'s paper, *London*, was to start next week. He had no writer of political leading articles. Would I do a "leader"? But I was *not* in favor of Lord Lytton's Afghan policy. How could I do a leader? Well, I did a neutral-tinted thing, with citations from Aristophanes! I found presently some scribes for G. B. What a paper that was! I have heard that G. B. paid in handfuls of gold, in handfuls of bank-notes. Nobody ever read it, or advertised in it, or heard of it. It was full of the most wonderfully clever verse in old French forms. They were (it afterwards appeared) by Mr. W. E. Henley. Mr. Steven-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

son had met him, while he was doing his series of *Hospital Sonnets* in Edinburgh, and they became very close friends. Mr. Stevenson himself astonished and delighted the public of *London* (that is, the contributors) by his *New Arabian Nights*. Nobody knew about them but ourselves, a fortunate few. Poor G. B. died, and Mr. Henley became the editor. I may not name the contributors, the flower of the young lions, elderly lions now, there is a new race. But one lion, a distinguished and learned lion, said already that fiction, not essay, was Mr. Stevenson's field. Well both fields were his, and I cannot say whether I would be more sorry to lose *Virginibus Puerisque* and *Studies of Men and Books*, or *Treasure Island* and *Catriona*. With the decease of G. B., Pactolus dried up in its mysterious sources, *London* struggled and disappeared.

Mr. Stevenson was in town, now and again, at the old Savile Club, which had the tiniest and blackest of smoking-rooms. Here, or somewhere, he spoke to me of an idea of a tale, a Man who was Two Men. I said "William Wilson!" and declared that it would never do. But his "Brownies," in a vision of the night, showed him the central scene, and he wrote *Jekyll and Hyde*. My "friend of these days and of all days," Mr. Charles Longman, sent me the manuscript. In a very common-place London drawing-room, at 10:30 P. M., I began to read it. Arriving at the place where Utterson, the lawyer, and the butler wait outside the Doctor's room, I threw down the MS. and fled in a hurry. I had no taste for solitude any more. The story won its great success, partly by dint of the moral (whatever that may be), more by its terrible lucid visionary power. I remember Mr. Stevenson telling me, at this time, that he was doing some "regular crawlers," for this purist had a boyish habit of slang, and I *think* it was he who called Julius Cæsar "the howlingest cheese who ever lived." One of the "crawlers" was *Thrawn Janet*; after *Wandering Willie's Tale* (but certainly *after* it), to my taste, it seems the most wonderful story of the "supernatural" in our language.

Mr. Stevenson had an infinite pleasure in Boisgobey, Montépin, and, of course, Gaboriau. You see, there was nothing of the "cultured person" about him. Concerning a novel dear to culture, he said that he would die by my side, in the last ditch, proclaiming it the worst fiction in the world. It was nothing of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the kind; very much the reverse; but it was *not* to his taste or mine, what a vain people supposes. I make haste to add that I have only known two men of letters as free as Mr. Stevenson, not only from literary jealousy, but from the writer's natural, if exaggerated, distaste for work in his own line, which is very different in aim and method from his own. I do not remember another case in which he dispraised any book; and in this instance what he said was "only his fun." I do remember his observations on a novel then and now very popular, but not to his taste, nor, indeed, by any means impeccable, though stirring. Mr. Stevenson's censure and praise were both just. From his occasional fine efforts the author, he said, should have cleared away acres of brushwood, of ineffectual matter. It was so, no doubt, as the writer spoken of would be ready to acknowledge. But he was an improviser of genius, and Mr. Stevenson was a conscious artist.

Of course we did by no means always agree in literary estimates; no two people do. But when certain works—in his line in one way—were stupidly set up as rivals of his, the person who was most irritated was not he, but his equally magnanimous contemporary. There was no thought of rivalry or competition in either mind. The younger romancists who arose after Mr. Stevenson went to Samoa were his friends by correspondence; from them, who never saw his face, I hear of his sympathy and encouragement. Every writer knows the special temptations of his tribe: they were temptations not even felt, I do believe, by Mr. Stevenson. His heart was far too high, his nature was every way as generous as his hand was open. It is in thinking of these things that one feels afresh the greatness of the world's loss; for "a good heart is much more than style," writes one who knew him only by way of letters.

It is a trivial reminiscence that we once plotted a Boisgobesque story together. There was a prisoner in a Muscovite dungeon.

"We'll extract information from him," I said.

"How?"

"With corkscrews."

But the mere suggestion of such a process was terribly distasteful to him; not that I really meant to go to these extreme lengths. We never, of course, could really have worked together;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and, his maladies increasing, he became more and more of a wanderer, living at Bournemouth; at Davos, in the Grisons; finally, as all know, in Samoa. Thus, though we corresponded, not unfrequently, I never was of the inner circle of his friends. Among men there were school or college companions, or companions of Paris and Fontainebleau, cousins, like Mr. R. A. M. Stevenson, or a stray senior, like Mr. Sidney Colvin. From some of them, or from Mr. Stevenson himself, I have heard tales of "the wild Prince and Poins." That he and a friend travelled utterly without baggage, buying a shirt where a shirt was needed, is a fact, and the incident is used in *The Wrecker*. Legend says that once he and a friend *did* possess a bag, and also, nobody ever knew why, a large bottle of scent. But there was no room for the bottle in the bag, so Mr. Stevenson spilled the whole contents over the other man's head, taking him unawares, that nothing might be wasted. I think the tale of the endless staircase, in *The Wrecker*, is founded on fact, so are the stories of the *atelier*, which I have heard Mr. Stevenson narrate at the Oxford and Cambridge Club. For a nocturnal adventure, in the manner of the *New Arabian Nights*, the critic already spoken of must be consulted. It is not my story. In Paris, at a café, I remember that Mr. Stevenson heard a Frenchman say the English were cowards. He got up and slapped the man's face.

"*Monsieur, vous m'avez frappé!*" said the Gaul.

"*A ce qu'il parait,*" said the Scot, and there it ended. He also told me that years ago he was present at a play, I forget what play, in Paris, where the moral hero exposes a woman "with a history." He got up and went out, saying to himself:

"What a play! what a people!"

"*Ah Monsieur, vous êtes, bien jeune*!" said an old French gentleman.

Like a right Scot, Mr. Stevenson was fond of "our auld ally of France," to whom our country and our exiled kings owed much good and some evil.

I rather vaguely remember another anecdote. He missed his train from Edinburgh to London, and his sole portable property was a return ticket, a meerschaum pipe, and a volume of Mr. Swinburne's poems. The last he found unmarketable; the pipe, I think, he made merchandise of, but somehow his provender for the day consisted in one Bath bun, which he could not finish.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These trivial tales illustrate a period in his life and adventures which I only knew by rumor. Our own acquaintance was, to a great degree, literary and bookish. Perhaps it began "with a slight aversion," but it seemed, like madeira, to be ripened and improved by his long sea voyage; and the bitter news of last week has taught me, at least, the true nature of the affection which he was destined to win. Indeed, our acquaintance was like the friendship of a wild, singing bird and of a punctual, domesticated barn-door fowl, laying its daily "article" for the breakfast table of the citizens. He often wrote to me from Samoa, sometimes with news of native manners and folklore. He sent me a devil-box, the "luck" of some strange island, which he bought at a great price. After parting with its "luck," or fetish (a shell in a curious wooden box), the island was unfortunate, and was ravaged by measles.

I occasionally sent out books needed for Mr. Stevenson's studies, of which more will be said. But I must make it plain that, in the body, we met but rarely. His really intimate friends were Mr. Colvin and Mr. Baxter (who managed the practical side of his literary business between them); Mr. Henley (in partnership with whom he wrote several plays); his cousin, Mr. R. A. M. Stevenson; and, among other *literati*, Mr. Gosse, Mr. Austin Dobson, Mr. Saintsbury, Mr. Walter Pollock knew him well. The best portrait of Mr. Stevenson that I know is by Mr. W. B. Richmond, A. R. A., and is in that gentleman's collection of contemporaries, with the effigies of Mr. Holman Hunt, Mr. William Morris, Mr. Browning, and others. It is unfinished, owing to an illness which stopped the sittings, and does not show the subject at his best, physically speaking. There is also a brilliant, slight sketch, almost a caricature, by Mr. Sargent. It represents Mr. Stevenson walking about the room in conversation.

The people I have named, or some of them, knew Mr. Stevenson more intimately than I can boast of doing. Unlike each other, opposites in a dozen ways, we always were united by the love of letters, and of Scotland, our dear country. He was a patriot, yet he spoke his mind quite freely about Burns, about that apparent want of heart in the poet's *amours*, which our countrymen do not care to hear mentioned. Well, perhaps, for some reasons, it had to be mentioned once, and so no more of it.

Mr. Stevenson possessed more than any man I ever met, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power of making other men fall in love with him. I mean that he excited a passionate admiration and affection, so much so that I verily believe some men were jealous of other men's place in his liking. I have met a stranger who, having become acquainted with him, spoke of him with a touching fondness and pride, his fancy reposing, as it seemed, in a fond contemplation of so much genius and charm. What was so taking in him? and how is one to analyze that dazzling surface of pleasantry, that changeful shining humor, wit, wisdom, recklessness; beneath which beat the most kind and tolerant of hearts?

People were fond of him, and people were proud of him: his achievements, as it were, sensibly raised their pleasure in the world, and, to them, became parts of themselves. They warmed their hands at that centre of light and heat. It is not every success which has these beneficent results. We see the successful sneered at, decried, insulted, even when success is deserved. Very little of all this, hardly aught of all this, I think, came in Mr. Stevenson's way. After the beginning (when the praises of his earliest admirers were irritating to dull scribes) he found the critics fairly kind, I believe, and often enthusiastic. He was so much his own severest critic, that he probably paid little heed to professional reviewers. In addition to his *Rathillet*, and what other MSS. he destroyed, he once, in the Highlands, long ago, lost a portmanteau with a batch of his writings. Alas, that he should have lost or burned anything! "King's chaff," says our country proverb, "is better than other folk's corn."

I have remembered very little, or very little that I can write, here and now; and about our last meeting, when he was so near death, in appearance, and so full of courage—how can I speak? His courage was a strong rock, not to be taken or subdued. When unable to utter a single word, his pencilled remarks to his attendants were pithy and extremely characteristic. This courage and spiritual vitality made one hope that he would, if he desired it, live as long as Voltaire, that reed among oaks. There were, of course, in so rare a combination of characteristics, some which were not equally to the liking of all. He was highly original in costume, but, as his photographs are familiar, the point does not need elucidation. Life was a drama to him, and he delighted, like his own British admirals, to do things with a certain air. He observed himself, I used to think, as he observed others, and "saw

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

himself" in every part he played. There was nothing of the *cabotin* in this self-consciousness; it was the unextinguished childish passion for "playing at things" which remained with him. I have a theory that *all* children possess genius, and that it dies out in the generality of mortals, abiding with people whose genius the world is forced to recognize. Mr. Stevenson illustrates, and perhaps partly suggested, this private philosophy of mine.

I have said very little; I have no skill in reminiscences, no art to bring the living aspect of the man before those who never knew him. I faintly see, myself, the eager face, the light nervous figure, the fingers busy with rolling cigarettes; Mr. Stevenson talking, listening, often rising from his seat, standing, walking to and fro, always full of vivid intelligence, wearing a mysterious smile. I remember one pleasant dark afternoon, when he told me many tales of strange adventures, narratives which he had heard about a murderous lonely inn, somewhere in the States. He was as good to hear as to read. I do not recollect much of that delight in discussion, in controversy, which he shows in his essay on conversation, where he describes, I believe, Mr. Henley as "Burley," and Mr. Symonds as "Opalstein." He had great pleasure in the talk of the late Professor Fleeming Jenkyn, which was both various and copious. But in these *noctes coenæque deum* I was never a partaker. In many topics, such as angling, golf, cricket, whereon I am willingly diffuse, Mr. Stevenson took no interest. He was very fond of boating and sailing in every kind; he hazarded his health by long expeditions among the fairy isles of ocean, but he "was not a British sportsman," though for his measure of strength a good pedestrian, a friend of the open air, and of all who live and toil therein.

As to his literary likings, they appear in his own confessions. He revelled in Dickens, but, about Thackeray—well, I would rather have talked to somebody else! To my amazement, he was of those (I think) who find Thackeray "cynical." "He takes you into a garden, and then pelts you with"—horrid things! Mr. Stevenson, on the other hand, had a more free admiration of Mr. George Meredith than I can assert for myself. He did not so easily forgive the *longueurs* and laxnesses of Scott, as a Scot should do. He read French much; Greek only in translations.

Literature was, of course, his first love, but he was actually

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an advocate at the Scottish Bar, and, as such, had his name on a brazen door-plate. Once he was a competitor for a Chair of Modern History in Edinburgh University; he knew the romantic side of Scottish history very well. In his novel, *Catriona*, the character of James Mohr Macgregor is wonderfully divined. Lately I read some unpublished letters of Catriona's unworthy father written when he was selling himself as a apy (and lying as he spied) to the Hanoverian usurper. Mr. Stevenson might have written these letters for James Mohr; they might be extracts from *Catriona*.

In turning over old Jacobite pamphlets, I found a forgotten romance of Prince Charles's hidden years, and longed that Mr. Stevenson should retell it. There was a Treasure, an authentic treasure; there were real spies, a real assassin; a real, or reported rescue of a lovely girl from a fire at Strasbourg, by the Prince. The tale was to begin *sur le pont d'Avignon*: a young Scotch exile watching the Rhone, thinking how much of it he could cover with a salmon fly, thinking of Tay or Beauly. To him enter another shady tramping exile, Blairthwaite, a murderer. And so it was to run on, as the author's fancy might lead him, with Allan Breck and the Master for characters. At last, in unpublished MSS. I found an actual Master of Ballantrae, a Highland chief—noble, majestically handsome—and a paid spy of England! All these papers I sent out to Samoa, too late. The novel was to have been dedicated to me, and that chance of immortality is gone, with so much else.

Mr. Stevenson's last letters to myself were full of his concern for a common friend of ours, who was very ill. Depressed himself, Mr. Stevenson wrote to this gentleman—why should I not mention Mr. James Payn?—with consoling gayety. I attributed his depression to any cause but his own health, of which he rarely spoke. He lamented the "ill-staged fifth act of life"; he, at least, had no long hopeless years of diminished force to bear.

I have known no man in whom the pre-eminently manly virtues of kindness, courage, sympathy, generosity, helpfulness, were more beautifully conspicuous than in Mr. Stevenson, none so much loved—it is not too strong a word—by so many and such various people. He was as unique in character as in literary genius.

ANDREW LANG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROBLEMS IN THE INDIAN TERRITORY.

BY SENATOR ORVILLE H. PLATT, OF CONNECTICUT.

POLITICAL and social problems in the Indian Territory are unique, complicated, and pressing. The name "Territory" is misleading. It suggests the existence of an ordinary Territorial government, when, in fact, there is no organization except that of the so-called Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, viz., the Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Seminoles. The last-named tribe has little more than the usual tribal government, and may be practically omitted when considering the questions arising there. Each of the other tribes named has an organized government copied in form from that of the United States, a written constitution, a legislature composed of two houses, written and published laws, elections, courts, judges, juries, civil officers, and indeed all the forms and methods of self-government. Each tribe claims to be an independent nation with every attribute of sovereignty—in fact, a foreign power. The Indian is not a citizen of the United States, but of the "nation" to which he belongs. In conversation he speaks of "our" government and "your" government as an Englishman would. Our courts neither exercise nor claim jurisdiction in controversies or offences between the members of the several tribes. It is insisted that the United States has by repeated treaties so recognized these "nations" and guaranteed them autonomy that any interference whatever on our part would be violative of national honor.

We have, then, the startling proposition that within the boundaries of the United States four other republics have a rightful, independent existence, free from our control, and that our only possible relation to them as separate governments is an obligation to continue their existence. It needs only the statement of such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a claim to show how much of perplexity and probable trouble it involves. If these alleged nationalities were composed of our own citizens, with common habits, occupations, and ambitions—if, for example, four counties in the State of New York claimed to be separate and complete republics, free from State or National control—it would be a most perplexing situation; but when the citizens of these Indian "nations," who have so little in common with our people socially or commercially, regard themselves as aliens, cherishing, not unnaturally, perhaps, a feeling of latent hostility, and retain in great degree Indian traits, characteristics, and traditions, the problem becomes very serious.

The question naturally arises, How did this state of affairs originate, and why does it continue? Without exactness as to dates, it may be said that prior to 1830 the Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, and Chickasaws lived in States east of the Mississippi River, occupying or roving over large tracts of territory claimed by them respectively as their own. Conflicts between them and the whites were constantly occurring, and the land and hunting grounds claimed by them were constantly encroached upon, till life became intolerable both for whites and Indians.

In General Jackson's administration a plan was developed by which the lands claimed by the Indians were to be purchased and they themselves were to be removed west of the Mississippi. This plan was carried out in the years between 1830 and 1840. The lands comprising all that country which has been marked on our maps as Indian Territory, including the present Territory of Oklahoma, were given in exchange for lands east of the Mississippi, and in addition large cash payments were made, which constitute the trust funds now held in the Treasury for the respective tribes. They have parted from time to time with their title to lands not actually occupied, so that our Government has reacquired the Oklahoma lands and opened them to settlement; and the Indian Territory now comprises only the lands at present occupied by these several tribes.

This country is about as large as the State of Indiana, equals that State in fertility of soil, salubrity of climate, and surpasses it probably in coal, minerals, and valuable timber. It is occupied by the respective tribes in separate sections under patents granted by the United States. These patents in each instance convey the lands to the tribe so that the title is in the whole tribe

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—a title in common. Each tribe has its own lands, and no interest in the lands of the others except that, by agreement between themselves, the Choctaws and Chickasaws have a joint interest.

The alleged guarantees that these Indian "nations" shall have complete autonomy and perpetual existence are embodied in certain stipulations on the part of the United States in various treaties, which without lengthy quotations may be summarized as follows: Agreements that these Indian tribes should never without their own consent be included within the territorial limits or jurisdiction of any State or Territory, but should have the right to make and carry into effect all laws for the government and protection of the persons and property within their own country belonging to their own people, or of such persons as had connected themselves with them, if such laws were not inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States and the so-called intercourse acts of Congress; also, that the United States should protect the Indians "against interruptions or intrusions of citizens of the United States who may attempt to settle in the country without their consent," and should remove such persons from their country if they should find lodgment there; also, that the several tribes should have the sole right to determine questions of Indian citizenship. From the treaties it is also perfectly clear that each tribe took the title to its lands in trust for the equal benefit of all its members. In some of the treaties it is expressed that every Indian "shall have an equal right with every other Indian in each and every portion of the Territory"; and such is the unmistakable meaning of all.

Referring to accounts of the negotiations of the treaties containing these alleged guarantees of continuous independent government, there can be no difference of opinion as to the reason for them. These stipulations were inserted upon the express request of the Indians that they should be permitted to live by themselves, and while thus living regulate their own affairs, and that white people should not be permitted to "obtain a lodgment there." The treaties imply a promise on the part of the Indians to live by themselves, as certainly as they contain a promise on our part that they should be protected against the intrusion of whites. The letter as well as the spirit of these treaties was to secure to the Indians exclusive occupation of the country for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equal benefit of all members of the tribes, and self-goverment in their isolation. Neither party ever contemplated a continuance of the tribal or Indian governments when a few should have appropriated all the land and when white people should by invitation of the Indians have come to "secure a lodgment" and outnumber the Indians four to one. Nor can it be supposed that it was intended that these Indian governments should be perpetuated when they no longer answered the purpose of government either for Indian or white.

Great changes have taken place since the original negotiation of these treaties. The country to which those Indians removed was then a thousand miles beyond the westernmost limit of civilization. Its adaptability to civilized life was probably unsuspected. The Indian then lived largely by the chase. The buffalo and antelope were to be found on the plains; other large and small game in the hills. It was an ideal hunting-ground. No one looked forward to the time when wheat, corn, and cotton should be raised there for shipment to different States and foreign countries; when seven railways should traverse the territory, and twenty thousand miners should be engaged in bringing its underlying coal to the surface; when three hundred thousand white people should reside there with the consent of the Indians; when towns and cities should spring up as if by magic; when the telegraph and telephone should connect it with the outside world, and the requirements of modern business enterprise should grow more pressing day by day. The desert has blossomed; the wilderness is under cultivation. The new conditions must be confronted and dealt with. Five separate Indian governments, dealing only with Indian citizens and their property, are no longer adequate, or, indeed, tolerable. There must be government there for whites as well as for Indians, and it must be adapted to the wants of both.

The presence of so many white people in this Indian country needs explanation. Laws have been passed by each of the Indian governments which permit Indian citizens to secure the use of as much unoccupied land as they may choose to appropriate by fencing or other method of occupancy. Complying with the letter, but in violation of the spirit, of these laws, immense tracts of fertile land have been appropriated by individual Indian citizens. In such appropriation, the white man, who has become

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an "Indian" merely by intermarriage, has taken the land until at the present time it may be said with approximate accuracy that less than five hundred Indian citizens, a large proportion of whom have not a drop of Indian blood in their veins, have secured and occupy nine-tenths of the agricultural and grazing land of the country. Sometimes occupancy is secured by fencing, sometimes simply by ploughing a furrow around the tract. Some of the holdings thus secured by white "Indian" citizens exceed 100,000 acres in extent. In the Creek Nation sixty-one persons have thus appropriated and hold 1,237,000 acres, practically all the valuable arable and grazing land belonging to the nation. This is perhaps the most glaring illustration of land monopoly prevailing there, although among all the tribes it is true that a few persons have acquired and are holding most of the valuable land.

Very few full-blood Indians, if any, are among these great landholders. The white Indian has been the most rapacious. The mixed bloods have engaged in this wholesale appropriation to some extent. As a rule, however, the full blood and most of the mixed bloods are practically shut out from the occupancy of the land. The trust created by the conveyances from the United States to the Indians, under which the lands were to be held in common for the equal benefit of the members of the tribe, is thus utterly disregarded.

To cultivate these immense holdings, tenants are required. The land monopolist, therefore, rents his holding in sections to white farmers, or in the "nations," where renting is forbidden by law, resorts to the fiction of employing white laborers, and the Indian councils or legislatures issue permits for the white laborers who thus come to occupy the land held by the white or half-breed Indian landlord. Over the farming area of the country there are settlements of white farmers occupying with the permission of the Indian land monopolist and paying rent to them either in money or in kind. The whole agricultural land has thus been settled up as really and as truly as in Oklahoma. This involves the necessity of towns, trades, professions, and the business methods of white civilization. Buildings for trade and residence are erected upon lots, the use of which is conveyed to the white occupant by the Indian landholder, and this kind of occupancy is rapidly increasing.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Probably nowhere else in the world since the time of the feudal barons has there been a condition of society demanding reformation equal to that now demanded in the Indian Territory. As might be expected, the Indian citizen landholders control the Indian governments absolutely, and no law can be passed in Indian legislatures interfering with their greed; and any law which they desire enacted for their benefit is secured either by appeals to prejudice, by threats, or by open bribery. The landholder has thus acquired his holding without cost to himself, and is as secure in its possession under the present *régime* as if he had a patent from the United States.

The full-blood Indian, as a rule, is poor, shiftless, and ignorant, without ambition and without opportunity. He cannot acquire any land beyond a miserable holding of an acre or two in the mountainous country. The opportunities for further development and civilization are absolutely denied to him, while his patrimony is absorbed by the rapacious white Indian or half-breed. In every particular the progress of the full-blood Indian has been arrested. He is not advancing, he is retrograding.

Modern observation and thought have reached the conclusion that allotment of land in severalty, and citizenship, are the indispensable conditions of Indian progress. Neither one is possible while the present Indian governments continue. The share of the common Indian has been as truly stolen from him as if he had been driven off the land by white men. There will never be a division and allotment until Congress shall take the matter in hand and compel it; and the longer this is delayed the greater is the probability that justice will never be done the Indian.

When the Dawes commission went to the Territory to negotiate for allotment it is believed that a majority of the members of the different tribes desired it, but they were soon given to understand that it would not be safe to advocate it openly. When a delegation, which came in fear and trembling to say to the commission that they hoped the land would be allotted, was asked to sign a petition to that effect, the reply was: "We can't do that; it lightens behind the trees at night."

The fact is, these so-called Indian governments are failures. They are controlled absolutely by the few Indians who have acquired the lands in the manner described. They are not Indian republics; they are white oligarchies. The purchase of legisla-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tures, of courts and juries, and of the entire civil and criminal administration, is open and unblushing, and virtually undenied. The Indian governments no longer protect life, liberty, and property. There is good authority for saying that during the past year there have been over two hundred and fifty murders committed in the Indian Territory by and among Indians, who, including negro citizens, do not exceed 67,000; yet not a half-dozen murderers have been punished, and in a great majority of the cases proceedings have never been instituted. In an Indian newspaper just received, among the news items there is this allusion to the situation showing as perhaps nothing else can how cheaply human life is regarded among the Indians. The item reads: "There is altogether too much killing in the nation."

It is to be observed that the white people living in the Territory are entirely without government. They have no part in the Indian governments, nor can the Indian governments make laws for them. They cannot vote, they cannot have municipal organization, they can have no school system, no public construction of roads or bridges, no taxation, and none of the privileges and responsibilities of American citizens. In the white towns some voluntary schools for white children are maintained; but in the agricultural localities there are no schools, and the white children are growing up with positively no teaching. As a consequence of this unsettled, unorganized condition of society, the country is a resort for desperadoes and refugees, and crimes and depredations are rampant.

This statement of the situation of affairs, not exaggerated but rather understated, shows that there must be a change of government there; that the Indian governments are no longer adequate or useful. The stipulations in the treaties made with those Indians that they should be permitted to govern themselves, and that white people should not be allowed to dwell among them, are no longer obligatory. The moral obligation to keep the letter of a treaty ceases when the reason for the treaty no longer exists and the other party to the agreement has failed to carry out the original purpose and spirit of the treaty. That the reason for the guarantees on the part of the United States no longer exists is unquestioned; that the Indian governments no longer hold their lands for the equal benefit of the members of their tribes is equally undeniable.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Has the United States no duty to perform in such a state of affairs? Was it absolved from every duty and obligation to protect and secure the welfare of the Indians belonging to those tribes when by treaty it agreed that they might govern themselves in their desired isolation? Was it absolved from all obligation to protect white citizens who might be invited into that country by the Indians themselves and to provide for their welfare?

Our obligation to the Indian demands that we should secure for the common Indian of those tribes his rights now denied to him, and give him the opportunity for advancement in civilization and happiness. Our obligation to the white citizen of the United States, whom the Indians have encouraged and invited to dwell among them, demands that we should take such steps as will secure to him the reasonable rights and privileges of citizenship.

The situation is rapidly growing worse. If Congress may not act when 300,000 white people are domiciled there, it will have no better right to act when there are a million white people there. Unless something is speedily done, a condition of things will soon be developed which will shock our whole people. The problem is so complicated that it is impossible within the limits of this article to discuss the best method of reform and relief. One thing is certain—whatever is done must be done by Congress. The white men, who going through the farce of Indian marriage have become Indian citizens, and the half-breeds have already despoiled the real Indian of his land. The Indian legislatures and courts are the creatures of the land monopolists, and the longer Congress postpones the work of securing to Indians and white men alike their just rights in the Indian Territory, the greater will the injustice and wrong become, and the more difficult the enforcement of a remedy.

ORVILLE H. PLATT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MATRIMONIAL PUZZLE.

BY HJALMAR HJORTH BOYESEN.

It is amazing with what unanimity the authors of all ages have reviled woman. But this very vilification is a tribute to her power. The barbed arrows of epigram with which the poets, from Horace and Virgil to Swift and Heine, have assailed their "dearest foes" have in most cases been disguised billets-doux or replies to rejected ones. The scandalous ode which the Roman man-about-town addressed to Lydia (*Parcius junctas quatiunt fenestras*) was notoriously an effusion of spite, prompted by a withdrawal of favors. In the case of Socrates, who said much severer things, we know how defenceless he was in the hands of his Xantippe; and it would have been cruel to deny the poor man the comfort of a few malicious epigrams at the expense of the sex. He was too wise to address them to Xantippe herself. For we are informed in what style that estimable lady retaliated when his remarks displeased her. The bucket of cold water with which she is said to have responded to his *repartées* would be likely to cure the most abandoned epigrammatist. Well, here are some of the observations in which he sought a vicarious revenge:

"Marriage is honey and wormwood. Why is it that the wife is so apt to spill the honey and leave nothing for her husband but the wormwood?"

"Believe no woman, even if she had risen from the dead."

"Woman is the fount of all evil."

"The love of a woman is far more to be feared than the hate of a man."

There is a sense in which both the first and the last of these epigrams are true, and the perpetual iteration of similar sentiments in the literature of all lands and ages certainly does indicate that, in a way, they embody the experience of the race. There surely can have been no collusion between the Greek

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

philosophers and the authors of the Hindoo Vedas, nor between either and the bards of the old Norse "Edda." And yet they all agree in representing marriage as a pitfall and love as a thing to be feared rather than desired. Take for instance the following quaint passage from the High Song of Odin (Havamal) in the "Elder Edda":

"The word of a girl
Let no man trust,
Nor that which a woman speaks.
On a whirling wheel
Her heart was made;
And fickleness dwells in her bosom.

"A flying arrow
Let no man trust,
Or the falling ebb-tide,
Or fresh-frozen ice,
Or the ringed snake,
Or a bride's fair speech,
Or a broken sword,
Or a playful bear,
Or the page of a king.

"For the love of woman,
Whose heart is crafty,
Is like unto riding
On a smooth-shod horse
On slippery ice;
On a fiery two-year-old
Which is all untamed;
Or like unto sailing
In a rudderless ship,
In a raging storm;
Or as if a cripple
Would catch a reindeer
Upon a glacier.

"But frank shall my speech be:
For both sides I know.
Fickle is man's mind
Also to woman.
When fairest we speak her
Falsest is our thought.
That may fool the wisest.

"Sweetly shalt thou speak;
Gifts shalt thou offer
If woman's love thou would'st win.
Praise the lovely one,
Praise loud her beauty,
Flatter her, if thou would'st win her."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is Odin, the sage father of gods and men, who offers this cynical advice to all intending candidates for matrimony, but evidently with no great expectation of having it followed. As if to emphasize the inapplicability of his maxims, he proceeds to relate some of his own gallant adventures in which he failed to practice the wisdom that he desired to impress upon others. But it is highly significant that he gains in one of these love affairs the gift of song, which more than compensates him for his loss of dignity. This gift of song, I take it, is but the symbol of that enrichment of soul and consequent widening and deepening of nature which no one can attain who evades the normal experience of the race. It was clearly meant that all men, as well as all women, should marry; and those who, for whatever reason, miss this obvious destiny are, from nature's point of view, failures. It is not a question of personal felicity (which in eight cases out of ten may be more than problematic), but of race responsibility. The unmarried man is a skulker, who, in order to secure his own ease, dooms some woman, who has a rightful claim upon him, to celibacy. And in so doing he defrauds himself of the opportunities for mental and moral development which only the normal experience can provide. He deliberately stunts the stature of his manhood, impoverishes his heart and brain, and chokes up all the sweetest potentialities of his soul. To himself he is apt to appear like the wise fox that detects the trap, though it be ever so cunningly baited; that refuses to surrender his liberty for the sake of an appetizing chicken or rabbit which may after all be a decoy, stuffed with sawdust; while, as a matter of fact, his case is that of the cowardly servant in the parable, who, for fear of losing his talent, hid it in a napkin, and in the end was deemed unworthy of his stewardship.

The epigrams on matrimony which abound in all languages, if not prompted by disappointment or resentment, are usually dictated by the narrowest prudence. They have either emanated from the crustiest kind of bachelors or from henpecked Benedicts. One of the few exceptions I can recall is that of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, who declared that the only thing which reconciled her to being a woman was that she could never marry one; and it was George Sand who so beautifully illustrated the truth of her own *bon mot*—"A woman always needs a support to lean on; but if she takes two, she falls." Goethe, whose personal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experience was not a happy one, derided the idea that marriage was intended for our personal gratification; but for all that he declared that it is "the beginning and the pinnacle of civilization."

"It makes the rough man gentle," he says; "and it gives the cultivated man the best opportunity to practise his gentleness." In "Iphigenia in Tauris" he has most nobly celebrated the mission of woman as a civilizer who softens savage hearts, refines rude manners, and makes a thousand flowers grow where before only prickly weeds flourished.

That the type of women which he has immortalized in Iphigenia is able to perform this miracle it were vain to deny; and if that type were only a little less exceptional, marriage would soon cease to be the knotty problem that it is. It would cease to be a correctional discipline and might approach the realization of the foolish hopes which enticed you to pass its portals. But a transport of perpetual beatitude would, I fancy, be an unwholesome thing, and would seem to be interdicted by the providential arrangement which furnishes every rose with thorns, deposits a worm in the core of the apple, and insinuates a discord even into the music of the spheres. I do not mean to imply that it is the wife who introduces the discord any oftener than it is the husband; and if literature appears to give a different impression, it is because literature until recently has spoken bass rather than soprano. To my mind, there is an everlasting gulf fixed between the masculine and the feminine pole of creation which can never be completely bridged. In its innermost being each remains to the other mysterious and incomprehensible. You may parley as much as you like, suspend hostilities, make unconditional surrender, and with the most honorable intentions vow everlasting peace; and yet the next morning your wife will rise with a strange chill in her manner; your intercourse, no matter what you do, will be pitched in a wrong key, and silence and speech will be equally irritating and dangerous. A fool you are if you try to discover the cause of her displeasure. The chances are ten to one that she is herself unable to state it. It is simply a mystery—the eternal mystery of sex.

It is the fashion nowadays to minimize or utterly ignore this radical difference between man and woman. It is the fashion to charge all incompatibility and consequent misery solely to man's account, and represent the woman as an abused and misunder-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stood archangel. "What is the reason that so many marriages are unhappy?" asked a revered sentimentalist in last year's Woman Suffrage campaign; and amidst a burst of applause he replied, "It is man's selfishness."

It would, in my opinion, have been fully as correct, or as incorrect, if he had answered, "It is woman's selfishness." As a matter of fact, it is six of one and half a dozen of the other. Women of the upper classes have been petted and deferred to almost from babyhood, and have been taught to regard themselves as privileged persons. Every stone is carefully removed from their path, reality is expurgated for their benefit, their very religion is refined and tempered to their delicate constitutions. One need not go so far as the Swedish Count Oxenstjerna, who declared that the religion of women consisted in serving God without being discourteous to the Devil. But it is undoubtedly true that as individuals they have lost rather than gained by being shielded and protected from all rude and painful contact with reality. And in so far as the so-called Woman's Rights Movement has for its object to develop a sturdier self-reliance in girls, and thereby lift them out of their condition of immaturity and tutelage, I heartily sympathize with it. You cannot artificially limit experience without impairing growth, diminishing the chances of survival, and blighting the germs of character. Every child which comes into the world, whether male or female, has, abstractly speaking, a full right to know the life into which it is born; to test its educational value, and by its rough and trying discipline to develop whatever powers there may be slumbering in it.

"Whether women, when they have learned to stand alone, will want to marry I do not know; but that they will be unwilling to accept marriage on the present terms I hold to be highly probable. Their preference would, no doubt, be to claim the benefits both of their old protected condition and their new estate of quasi-emancipation. But, as Ibsen* says, it is the soul which must revolt; and their souls have not yet revolted. They like too well the flowers, the sugar-plums, and the compliments of their gilded servitude to exchange them for the votes and responsibilities and drudgeries that must follow in the train of the equality for which they are aspiring. There are no privileges

* H. H. Boyesen's *Commentary on the Writings of Henrik Ibsen*, p. 216.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which do not also involve duties. If women are the equals of men, they are not entitled to dower in their husbands' estates, any more than husbands are entitled to dower in the estates of their wives. If at the same time they jostle men in their professions and become their competitors in the struggle for existence, the chivalrous sentiments with which they are now regarded will not long survive. They must make their choice with their eyes open. Either—or! There is no middle way, no combining the privileges and shirking the disadvantages of two conditions, so diametrically opposed.

It is because they are trying to do this very thing that such a large number of women, at the present time, make such wretched wives. They are the transitional types which are neither fish, flesh, nor fowl, and therefore fit badly into every position. If they desire equality, independence, and development of individuality (which is surely a legitimate desire), they ought to have the courage to face celibacy and renounce matrimony. For equality in matrimony is an "iridescent dream." Nature herself has done her best to interdict it. And as for independence, it is like the Blue Flower of the German Romanticists, which is always beckoning to you from the distance, whose fragrance intoxicates you; but which vanishes between your fingers if you attempt to pluck it. Surely the last place to look for it would be in matrimony. If the one partner is solar, the other has to consent to be lunar. One or the other must be the satellite. Two suns were never yet known to revolve in the same orbit. It would result in a cosmic cataclysm. It were too much, perhaps, at this late day, to expect an American wife to walk by what Carlyle called the lamp of obedience, which, however inconvenient, is yet a safer guide to happiness than the wayward lamp of independence which nine dear little damsels out of every ten now keep concealed under their wedding-gowns. "I want to live my own life," you now hear them cry on every hand; and there can be no objection to such a resolution, if they are also competent to make their own living, and have the courage to make it alone. Surely the husband surrenders his independence when he marries, and it would be absurd for the wife to expect to retain hers. Strike steel against steel and sparks will fly. Take two flinty, wilful, unmalleable characters, unite them in marriage, and they may be trusted to go to housekeeping in a neat and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commodious little purgatory, with fire and brimstone for daily diet.

"But love," cry my emancipated damsels, "where does love come in in your philosophy? Who cares for *Hamlet* with the prince left out?" Love, permit me humbly to remonstrate, delights not in self-assertion, but in self-surrender; and all this loud trumpeting of independence will make the shy little god hang his head with shame, if it does not frighten him away altogether. Even though he be present at the wedding, it takes a wise and generous landlord to induce him to remain. Where he is a life tenant, all problems dissolve into roseate vapor. Where he is not present they bristle with a thousand wounding prickles, like the quills upon the fretful porcupine. I saw him yesterday sit at table between a middle-aged statesman and his wife; and it was beautiful to witness how ignorant they both were that there was anything problematic in the relation between man and woman. It seemed to them as simple, natural, and satisfactory as it must have seemed to Adam, before the serpent began to talk philosophy to Eve. It was after that fatal discourse on the higher education that their matrimonial sky darkened and troubles began to thicken. Then the raven croaked in the Garden of Eden, the nightingale sang out of tune, and the turtle-doves fell to quarrelling in the Tree of Knowledge.

Matrimony had become a problem.

H. H. Boyesen.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY WE NEED A NATIONAL UNIVERSITY.

BY PROFESSOR SIMON NEWCOMB.

THE idea of founding a great university at the seat of government of the United States is as old as the Constitution. The subject was considered by the makers of that instrument, and it may fairly be inferred from the debates that it was dropped only because, under the clause relating to the District of Columbia, Congress had ample power to found a university. Washington took such interest in the project that he bequeathed to the nation in aid of it a sum which at the time appeared munificent, and which would have insured its successful foundation had the fund been securely and profitably invested. It is even said that he selected, on the banks of the Potomac, as a site for the institution, a hill which was afterward occupied by the old Naval Observatory. Presidents have formally recommended the measure, and philosophers and statesmen have shown its expediency. Yet we have entered upon the second century of our national existence without its having advanced beyond the preliminary stage of a bill before Congress.

A national university at Washington seems to me one of the most pressing of our public needs, and one which would long since have been supplied had not strong reasons in favor of doing so been very generally overlooked. I ask leave first to call attention to the harmony of the project with our general educational and political system. In the educational system, three grades or orders are now generally recognized—the common school, the gymnasium or college, and the university. Corresponding to these we have three political powers, on each of which one of these grades of education may legitimately call for assistance. The common-school education is one which every one aims to acquire, and of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which all feel the usefulness. It is of universal interest, and is therefore very properly supported by local institutions, towns, cities, and counties. In the next grade we have the education of the college and the professional and technical schools. The appliances necessary to this education cannot be adequately supplied by the local authorities, and the several States of the Union therefore make provision for it. This recognition of its usefulness has met with the approval of all parties, and is a just source of national pride. The eminent reasonableness of the policy is justified by the consideration that this order of education is of importance to the entire state. If we assume that half a million of the population are required in the learned professions, it is necessary that this number of young men should be properly trained for their duties to society, which are essentially of a public character.

With these two orders of education our political powers have hitherto stopped. But there is a third order, now generally known as post-graduate, which the needs of our time are bringing into prominence. Experience shows that the country and the world has important uses for men who have pursued more advanced studies than those of the college and the medical or law school. The number of such men who are needed is indeed small. One out of a thousand of the whole population, even one out of ten thousand, would suffice. Their utility to the social organism is not to be measured by their numbers, but by their functions. Their work is not only of State, but of national, importance. It is therefore eminently fitting as well as necessary to the perfection of our educational system, that the General Government should provide for the training of this class. That this has not long since been done arises from two causes : a belief that the need is adequately supplied by existing institutions, and, perhaps, a failure to recognize the true value and significance of the higher education.

In saying this I do not intimate that there is any lack of public appreciation of the higher education as a very excellent and noble feature of our social system. In no country is such education more liberally supported by individual effort. The munificence of our wealthy citizens in the endowment of institutions of learning and professorial chairs is not paralleled in any other country. Even were it maintained that these gifts are not always prompted by a pure love of learning for its own sake, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the perpetuation of the name of the donor is often a powerful motive, the contention would not weaken the argument. The very fact that the donor takes this method of securing fame shows that learning is honored by our people. If he made the mistake of confounding popular interest with public honor, he would undoubtedly found a national institution for the practice of some form of athletics, rather than a professorial chair.

But it is one thing to say that our public and representative men hold learning in high honor, and quite another to say that they plainly see its relations to the practical work of the nation. The prevailing view is that, while scientific progress and profound learning are very important factors in our national greatness, they are of little or no help in shaping public policy or guiding the work of an administrator. Yet careful thought will show that the higher education has a place in the social organism corresponding in importance to that of the brain in the physical organism, and that its functions are becoming more and more important with the increasing complexity of social and political conditions. If we should go back in imagination three centuries, and repeat the history of the world during that time, with the omission of only one man out of ten thousand, we would reach a nineteenth century with nothing distinctive to boast of. Take out Galileo, and a few other possible men of genius who might have made his discoveries, and we should have no knowledge of the laws of force and motion. Take away Copernicus, Kepler, Newton, and perhaps a hundred men who might possibly have replaced them, and we should have no knowledge of the laws governing the universe. Take a few physical investigators out of each generation, and we should know nothing of the force of steam. Take away a few professors who during the last century amused themselves with investigating the curious properties of electricity, and we should have no knowledge of the practical uses of that agent. Take out a few philosophers, and we should not have our present ideas of human rights, liberties, or popular government. Had one man in a million been taken from each generation we should reach the end of the nineteenth century with the world in the condition of the sixteenth.

If genius has now no such field for its activities as it has had in the past, it is also true that never has civilization had to deal with so many problems requiring both genius and learning for their solu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion as at the present moment. Fifty years ago our country was inhabited by individual men, who had few relations, either of commerce or sympathy, with men outside their own community. To-day our sixty millions of inhabitants are parts of a single organism, whose muscles are the railways, and whose nerves are the telegraph, both binding them so closely that every throb in the remotest part is felt through the whole. Thirty years ago labor unions were unknown outside their own places of meeting, and the labor question scarcely existed. To-day this question interests the entire community, and the problem of dealing with it is one of the most troublesome with which we are confronted. Our fathers devoutly accepted, without question, the weather which Providence gave them. We are chafing against our inability to so regulate the aërial currents that they shall water the arid plains into fertility, and asking whether we cannot so change the climate as to populate these plains. To our forefathers the Indians were simply perverse men, for whom the alternative was to be educated into citizens and preached into Christians, or suffer merited death as cumberers of the ground. We are beginning to look at them in a different light, and may hope ere long to base our policy in dealing with them upon a scientific basis.

That the solution of such problems as these should be aided by the highest ability and greatest skill that the government can command goes without saying. But our public does not get the full benefit of these agencies owing to the wide separation between the men who make our laws and deal with these problems, and the men devoted to study and research. The absence of close points of contact between our politics on the one hand, and our literature, art, and science on the other, is a remarkable feature of our political situation. It is true that our government does not fail to avail itself of college graduates to perform the technical duties for which their education fits them. It has been said—and I have no occasion to contest the truth of the statement—that we have a larger body of able scientists in the departments at Washington than at any other capital in the world. But these men have no voice in legislation, except such as appears in an appropriation bill. Their positions prevent them from being powerful factors in shaping the government policy, and render it undesirable that they they should become such factors. What we want is a closer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

touch between our public men on the one hand, and the higher education, not only in Washington, but in the country at large, on the other hand. The natural and appropriate medium for this would be a national university.

If it be admitted, as I think it must, that the influence of the intellect and culture of the nation upon its politics would be in every way beneficent, then we meet the question how that influence may be increased. A great mistake has been made in supposing that a national university at Washington means the founding of an American Paris, toward which all men of learning shall gravitate, thus lessening the influence of local centres. I therefore beg leave to point out that the effect would be directly the opposite, and that one of the public functions of the university would be the representation at the capital of the learning of the country at large. How little danger there would be of its attracting more students from the existing universities than it would stimulate to go thither is shown by the influence of the Johns Hopkins University upon the higher education throughout our land. The generous rivalry growing out of the efforts of this institution to do more than any other for the higher education has resulted in an increase in the facilities for the higher education at all our principal centres of learning, and in the number of students availing themselves of those facilities. We may confidently anticipate that a national university would have the same effect; that our colleges would everywhere exert themselves to come up to its requirements, that the patrons of those colleges would second their efforts, that the most talented youth would everywhere be stimulated by the consciousness that our political powers honored learning, and that every university in the land would become a more powerful factor than it now is in conferring upon the nation the benefits to be derived from the learning of its graduates.

Illustrations of the immediate practical usefulness of such an institution are not far to seek. Within the past thirty years untold losses in wealth, with their accompaniments of great suffering, have been caused to thousands of our people through settling on the arid lands of the West, under the belief that a change of climate would take place with cultivation. The accident of two or three summers of unusual moisture seemed sufficient to show the truth of the theory in question, and led to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rejection of more thorough considerations, which would have shown that a change of climate cannot be thus produced. Scarcely had the settlers reaped more than the first scanty crop before years of drouth set in, forcing whole communities to abandon all that was left of the product of their labor. Now, I make bold to say that, had the project of Washington to found a great university at the national capital been carried out, this would not have occurred. Among the subjects of research at such an institution would naturally have been climatology, especially that of our own country. From the very position and objects of the institution a study of this subject would have been prosecuted on an extended scale and founded on better data than those which have actually been used. Able men, desirous of diffusing the most accurate knowledge, would have studied, not only the history of climate in general, so far as it could be learned from records of centuries of observation, but they would also have inquired more carefully into the causes on which climate depends than our existing institutions of learning have had any occasion to do. The natural result would have been that this knowledge would be so diffused in government circles, that not only would no encouragement ever have been given to settlers to try their fortunes on the arid lands, but the latter would have had sources of information within their reach which would have guarded them against their hasty experiment.

I have seen but two reasons against the project which it seems necessary to consider. One is that the wider scope of the teaching at our leading universities, especially the establishment of courses of post-graduate instruction, renders a national university unnecessary. The argument has been met by almost all that has been said in the present paper. Our existing universities do not perform the functions of a national one as we have described them. If it should be claimed that through their graduates who enter into public life they form a connecting link between political thought at the national capital and the intellectual thought of the country at large, the mere statement of the claim would show how extremely slender is the link, and how far it comes from fulfilling the requirements of the situation. It may also be said that we already have more institutions of learning than are necessary, and that we should rather aim to strengthen those which exist than to establish a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new one. But the very object of a national university would be to correct a part of the evil arising from the scattering of our higher education over so many minor points. Formerly many of our colleges had preparatory schools attached. But experience showed that such a school was a positive disadvantage to the college. Now nothing need be said against the present practice of a student remaining at college after he has taken his first degree, in order to further pursue some special line of study. But the main object of a national university will be to concentrate a large amount of research and teaching ability upon those graduates of our colleges who wish to enjoy the advantages which come from association with men wholly devoted to the most advanced studies.

It is also said that party politics will enter into the management of such an institution, and that we shall have political professors as we have political men in other departments of the government. More than thirty years of observation and experience at the national capital have convinced the writer that there is no danger of this result. Politicians are practical men, and as a class are as earnestly desirous of promoting the public welfare as the people at large will permit them to be. The existing institutions of learning at the national capital, which are dependent upon government support, are in no way hampered by their connection with politics.

Finally, the advantages of the national capital in the way of libraries, collections, and the presence of technical facilities for study are very great. These facilities all the departments of the government are ready to place at the disposal of students with a liberality which might be considered as verging upon imprudence. The fact that Washington is a political centre, and the supposed focus of all political activity, would be an advantage rather than a drawback to an institution of learning. The students would be led to take that wide interest in public affairs which it is so often complained that our men of learning do not feel. Any disturbance of that serenity of thought essential to learning would amount only to a wholesome distraction, and would at the same time afford valuable object-lessons in the application of theory to practice.

SIMON NEWCOMB.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PSYCHICAL COMEDY.

BY CHARLES SEDGWICK MINOT.

IT IS foolish to search for marvels. The wise search for truth. Yet there are many who have done and are still doing the former, and in so far as they are seeking to find marvellous faculties of the human mind they are performers in the psychical comedy, and their acts and opinions form the basis of this article.

The attempt to find psychical marvels has been twofold in its chief manifestations,—it is being made in one way by the Theosophical Society and in another way by the Society for Psychical Research.

Why is it that so many persons have been carried away by their enthusiasm over those possibilities which have been claimed for man of late? It seems to me that our mental atmosphere is still surcharged with vague yearnings and with discontent at the natural limitations of man and of his life. Many persons, who often unconsciously are infected by these yearnings, feel dissatisfied with the Christian ideal and with the Christian acceptance of the limitations of life. Such unrelieved aspirations lead to Felix Adler's Society for Ethical Culture, send Matthew Arnold after "something not ourselves making for righteousness," or beguile others of less judgment to commune with spirits at mediumistic seances. But all alike seek for liberation from the limitations of human life, and yet they all appear profoundly unconscious of the labor, patience, and thoroughness which are necessary to win new knowledge. In the following pages I shall endeavor to show that the Theosophical Society has no claim to serious consideration, and that the Psychical Society has not met the conditions of scientific investigation in its researches upon thought-transference and phantasms—in short,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I shall endeavor to show that the psychical comedy is a drama of misdirected effort.

There is a goodly number of people who believe or half believe the extraordinary doctrines known as esoteric Buddhism, to which Mr. Sinnett first drew the attention of the reading public. All that Mr. Sinnett claims* is that esoteric Buddhism is "a mine of entirely trustworthy knowledge, from which all religions and philosophies have derived whatever they possess of truth." But then one does not expect prophets nowadays to be humble, especially not one who rivals even Ficino in adopting the erroneous superstitions of his age. Mr. Sinnett believes in the trustworthiness of his esoteric "mine," because its value is proved by a series of magical performances by a clever woman who called herself Madame Blavatsky! These proofs are narrated in the *Occult World* by Mr. Sinnett. The most extraordinary is one that occurred during a picnic party of our author's with Madame Blavatsky and others; an extra tea-cup was wanted and Madame Blavatsky procured one,—Sinnett tells us, by magic,—to match the set they had in use; the cup was found where she told the servants to search. To the exoteric the preliminary hiding of the cup is an arrant probability; but Mr. Sinnett, being unable to prove that Madame Blavatsky did hide the cup, is sure that she did not. Therefore, what we call a very shallow trick he calls a miracle, and, of course, everything a magician says must be true, so the esoteric faith in Madame Blavatsky is implicit and unquestioning.

This personage, who has become somewhat known as the founder of the Theosophical Society, was of Russian origin, and is said to have been born in 1831. As described by her friends, she appears to have been a singularly ill-natured, bad-tempered, unjust, unreasonable, and selfish person. They also asserted that she possessed marvellous knowledge, which placed her far above ordinary humanity in intellectual and moral power. The view is piquant. She came to America in 1873, stayed for some time, and wrote an esoteric treatise, entitled *Isis Unveiled*. While here she encountered a worthy but seemingly credulous gentleman (Colonel Olcott), and I believe principally through his co-operation started the Theosophical Society. The members of the society were to enjoy access to Madame Blavatsky's marvellous

* *Esoteric Buddhism*, p. 26 (first American edition).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knowledge, which was asserted to be derived from the secret teaching of very learned and superlative Orientals. Subsequently the headquarters of the society were transferred to India, where there was theosophic prosperity. Established in India the prophetess made many converts, the most important of whom was Mr. Sinnett. By a series of clever influences she worked upon him and gradually won him completely. She forged letters to him, which purported to come from one of the esoteric masters, a so-called Mahatma. These letters arrived magically; it was explained to the recipient that each letter was disintegrated, then passed through all intervening obstacles and finally reintegrated in the air near Mr. Sinnett and appeared intact before him. This method of correspondence seems to me far better than the present post. What he learned from these letters the docile disciple has put together in the work mentioned above, with the title *Esoteric Buddhism*.

Meanwhile another set of influences had begun to stir the public mind. In the background of the life of Western nations, and especially in the United States, were the vague wonders of spiritualism, clairvoyance, and mesmerism. The more intelligent have been inclined to deride the subject, while still holding a covert belief in there being something behind it all. This feeling led some into the psychical societies; others, less conservative, into esoteric Buddhism. Women especially were subject to the contagion. Some were merely interested; but there were, and are, many carried away by their enthusiasm for the delusion. It is a part of this movement that reveals itself in the deplorable success of the "mind-cure," and of the so-called "Christian Science."

What is to be said of Sinnett's *Esoteric Buddhism*? There is but one judgment defensible: it is as worthless rubbish as intelligent people were ever induced to give serious attention to. The magnitude of the author's claim we have measured already by a quotation. It is part of his task to show that all that is true in science and in religion agrees with his revelation; that is, with what Madame Blavatsky revealed to him. He accordingly makes several attempts to demonstrate that great scientific discoveries of the western world are mere items of Oriental esoteric knowledge. These attempts, however, are made with that presumption of which only excessive ignorance is capable. For ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ample, part of his system involves the existence of a great continent which formerly occupied the place of the present Atlantic Ocean. The hypothesis of such a continent was formerly under consideration by geologists, but has been positively rejected. Nevertheless, Sinnett writes: "Science has finally accepted the existence of the great continent," etc. Again, his cosmogony requires the absence of the missing links between species, and he can explain why naturalists find no missing links; as a matter of fact, they have found a great many. Again, he asserts that the vegetable precedes the animal in the process of development, but it is not true. It is true that Mr. Sinnett and his Mahatma are both gloriously ignorant of the elementary truths of natural science. To a naturalist a few pages would suffice to reveal that the very confirmations assumed by the author are based upon gross misconceptions and are often the most flagrant contradictions of the doctrines he advocates. In short, the facts of science are uncompromisingly against esoteric Buddhism. Another peculiarity of the book is that there is not one single iota of evidence for any one of its principal dogmas—it is all bare assertion. If anything more against it were needed we might point out that it is a numerical system of philosophy, being founded on the number seven; it is well known that numerical philosophies belong to the past and are incompatible with modern knowledge. The success of Sinnett's book must be attributed to its apparent plausibility, which might naturally mislead readers who were unfamiliar with the natural sciences and therefore would not at once recognize the worthlessness of the author's misconceptions of facts. Success it had, to an unusual measure, largely because readers were unconscious of its weakness, but chiefly because it fitted with a popular idea of evolution, and taught that we have many latent qualities, of which thought-transference is one, which we can cultivate. People like to be perfectible much more than to be perfect.

The most cruel blow to esoteric Buddhism came from Mr. Richard Hodgson, a talented and very conscientious investigator, who was sent out on behalf of the English Society for Psychical Research to examine into the theosophical phenomena. Upon his arrival in India he found that two of Madame Blavatsky's confederates, a man named Coulomb and his wife,* had quarrelled with

* See Mr. Hodgson's Report, *Proc. Soc. Psych. Research*, Part IX., p. 207.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her, and in revenge exposed the very commonplace tricks by which she had inspired, sustained, and magnified the faith of her followers. The most important phenomena were those of the letter-delivery by disintegration. The theosophists provided themselves with a little cabinet, which they called "the shrine," and placed upon the wall of one of their rooms. In this shrine were placed their letters of inquiry. The shrine was then closed, and while it was closed the letters disappeared and were replaced by the answers. The disciples believed that the letters were removed by disintegration, or the magic power of their occult instructor or Mahatma. He lived, they were told, in Thibet, and the answers were composed by him, disintegrated in Thibet and reintegrated in the shrine. Mr. Hodgson found that the shrine had a false back, by which it was accessible from Madame Blavatsky's bedroom, and the letters, which purported to come from the Mahatma, were ascertained to have been written by Madame Blavatsky in an assumed hand. Hence the exoteric conclusion of fraud on one side of the shrine and credulity on the other. Of course the leader was not alone; among her probable confederates was that Mr. Mohini, whose social success in London and Boston was one of the side scenes of the psychical comedy. Madame Blavatsky was certainly one of the most successful of impostors, and though not as entertaining as Collet, nor as clever as Cagliostro, yet she might well have deemed herself the peeress of the "Veiled Prophet of Khorassan," having founded a religious cult on shallow fraud.

Thus the theosophic attempt to widen the scope of human faculties collapses in the presence of scientific investigations.

The Society for Psychical Research has a very different history. It has always been under the leadership of honorable and earnest men. It has not only never had the slightest taint of fraud in its own proceedings, but it has also done invaluable services in exposing Madame Blavatsky and other charlatans and especially in studying the tricks employed by false mediums. It has endeavored to establish certain conclusions regarding phenomena of an order not hitherto admitted in science. Of its positive constructive work as a whole my own opinion is unfavorable, especially as regards its claim that telepathy and phantasms are objective realities.

The society may be said to owe its origin to the persistence of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spiritualists in their claims. For there were some English gentlemen, who thought that there might be some residuum of truth in spiritualism, and in order to test the accuracy of this opinion they founded in 1882 the Society for Psychical Research, with headquarters in London. The leaders in this society have been W. F. Barrett, Edmund Gurney, F. W. H. Myers, and H. Sidgwick. In the first formal publication of the society it was claimed that they had secured experimental proof that one mind could obtain ideas directly from another without the intervention of any of the ordinary channels of sense. The assertion was startling, for it was made by earnest and able men. It must have brought comfort to many a theosophist and spiritualist and have seemed the first sheaf in the harvest of conversions to their long-maligned views. Thought-transference, or, as it has been also termed, "*telepathy*," soon became a familiar subject of discussion. Meanwhile the society continued its work actively and gathered many wonderful stories of telepathy and apparitions. Indeed the work has been pushed with immense industry and is still going on.

In 1884 Professor W. F. Barrett visited America, and by his enthusiasm led to the formation of an American Society for Psychical Research, with headquarters at Boston. Another similar society has been formed recently in Australia. At present the American society is a branch of the English.

The early and rapid success of the English society must be attributed to the claim advanced by its leaders that they had obtained strong experimental evidence in favor of "telepathy." The alleged evidence consisted chiefly in a series of tests with the Creery family,* in which there were several children and a servant woman all capable of mind-reading. They were subjected to numerous trials by the three leaders of the psychical society, Barrett, Gurney, and Myers. In their report these gentlemen say † that their "great preoccupation throughout was to guard against delusion," and they imply that they successfully excluded deception. They also assert that "it seems not too much to say that the hypothesis of mere coincidence is practically excluded." It has since turned out that the children did have a system of signalling, which, though very simple and of a

* Report of the Committee on Thought-transference, *Proc. Soc. Psychical Research*, Part I., p. 13.
† *Proceedings Soc. Psychical Research*, Part I., p. 28.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kind likely to be noticed, none of the committee did notice; so that they were not expert enough to exclude deception.

All the English experiments on telepathy, so far as they are known to me, have been of the same type. One person, called the *agent* thinks of some simple idea, and another person called the *percipient* states after a short interval what idea he believes the agent's attention has been concentrated upon. By hypothesis the agent's mind transfers the idea directly to the percipient's mind, and the object of the experiments is to show that the percipient will state the idea in the agent's mind correctly so often that the coincidence cannot be explained on any theory of chance. Usually, if not always, both agent and percipient have been told the class of ideas to which the experiments were to be confined. For instance both performers know that a playing card is to be thought of, or a number of two digits. It is evident that by this means the chances of correct guessing are enormously increased. But in the majority of experiments there is still another factor, which has been neglected, which vitiates the experiments because it renders the chances of correct guessing very great indeed.

In the experiments referred to, the agent was allowed to choose the idea of a given class—for example, to select a playing card. In such cases there is by no means an equal chance for all the ideas, but on the contrary there is a much greater chance for one special idea, which is by far the most likely to occur to the agent. Moreover, the same idea is likely to occur to the percipient, because both agent and percipient follow the same laws of mental habit unconsciously. To illustrate with playing cards again, both agent and percipient are likely to think first of the ace of spades. If the agent is asked at once again to name a playing card, it is exceeding probable that he will not name the same one, but another, and probably the card next in order of unconscious preference; the same is likely to occur with the percipient. These statements are based upon three reports which I made to the American Society for Psychical Research * and upon material still unpublished. The unconscious preponderance of a very few ideas is simply enormous, and, were it not demonstrated by very large statistics, would be incredible. Equally startling is the uniformity of the mental habit in different persons. In view

* *Proceedings Amer. Soc. Psychical Research*, Vol. I.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these facts we must conclude that not a single experiment, in which the agent was allowed to select an idea from a class of ideas known to the percipient, can afford valid evidence of thought-transference. All the English experiments of this kind fail to fulfill the conditions of scientific investigation. It was a grave mistake to assume that with playing cards the chances of coincidence are 1 in 52. They are more nearly 1 in 5 or 10, but they have not been actually calculated.

In later experiments, especially with numbers of two digits, the English investigators have obviated this difficulty by selecting the number for the agent by chance. But even in these experiments the conditions for drawing correct inductions are not fulfilled. If thought-transference is a reality, then the numbers thought of by the percipient must *not* follow the percipient's mental habit. To make a rigorous demonstration, the percipient's mental number habit should be first determined; then the agent should be given the numbers somewhat in excess, which the percipient is not likely to think of readily, and, if then these numbers were reproduced by the percipient, it would indicate that there was some other factor at work than the usual mental habit. Up to the present time no evidence has been offered to show that the mental habit of the percipient was changed. Yet this is obviously indispensable if the experiments are to give any evidence of thought-transference. In this case, also, the demands of a scientific proof are not met. Nor do the experiments with drawings bear criticism better.

The reproduction of drawings by alleged thought-transference seemed at first to afford a remarkable proof of the reality of the phenomenon, but precisely in regard to that proof a more scientific examination of the matter forces us into extreme scepticism. The experiments we have made in America show that if a large number of diagrams are made (5,000) very many of them are alike, though they are drawn independently in sets of ten by 500 different people,* and there are here similar chances for coincidence to those with the cards. Of the English drawings supposed to have been reproduced by thought-transference nearly all are such as we know people are likely to draw, and as the probability of similar unconscious preferences in two individuals is very great, the probable reason in many cases why the percipient thought of

* *Proceedings American Society for Psychical Research*, Vol. I.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the same diagrams as the agent is not thought-transference, but identity of metal habit.

A few of the drawings were of a more complicated character, notably those in the trials conducted with Messrs. Smith and Blackburn under the auspices of the English Psychical Society.* In this special case it is possible to explain the apparent thought-transference by the hypothesis of intentional collusion between the performers, at least in great part. That the diagrams can be reproduced from descriptions, I have ascertained by trial, and that in many of the Smith-Blackburn experiments there was opportunity for signalling cannot be denied; therefore it is quite possible that in this instance the percipient was told by his confederate what to draw. That mere watching is not enough to guard against possible deception by expert collusionists is well known. This is emphatically illustrated by the slate-writing experiments by Mr. S. J. Davey, who, by conjuring, does very wonderful feats in that classic art. He obtained reports from a number of persons of what he had done, and these reports he has in part published in the Proceedings of the Psychical Society † together with comments to show how grossly inaccurate the reports usually are. Mr. Davey informs us that he does his tricks while the attention of the witness is turned from him. Yet Mr. A. Podmore states that he "was attentively regarding *both* slates," but in reality there was an interval of two or three minutes during which his attention was called away. Mrs. Johnson writes, "we are all quite certain that the slates were never out of the hands of one or the other of us." So it goes on with a long succession of reports, all erroneous. At the close of his interesting paper Mr. Davey says: "In conclusion I may say that the results of my investigation as to the possibilities of conjuring in relation to 'psychography' have been a revelation to myself, no less than to others. I am aware that in addition to the methods which I have employed for producing 'slate-writing' there are other methods, which I know to be conjuring, but which have not yet been shown to me; and I should certainly not be convinced of the genuineness of spiritualistic phenomena of this kind by any testimony such as I have seen recently published in great abundance, which presents so many

*See *Proceedings Psychical Society*, Vol. I., p. 1.
† *Proceed. English Soc. Psychical Research*, Vol. III., p. 405.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

close analogies to the reports of my own conjuring performances."

Mr. Hodgson, in commenting on these experiments,* has pointed out that Mr. Davey's feats are so incredible, *not one of the sitters having seen him write*, that we should have to assume a spiritual or occult agency if we had to rely only on the reports of witnesses. Mankind are inattentive, careless, and forgetful to a degree we are just beginning to discover. Now, the application of these remarkable demonstrations of human untrustworthiness to the experiments on thought-transference is evident, but yet not evident enough to warn the English investigators. The most impressive tests of which we have accounts are those the value of which depends upon the attentive watchfulness of the investigators. Now, we have not only the proof from Mr. Davey that attention is not a really sufficient guard, and that essential incidents may be utterly unnoticed, but also the proof from the collapse of the Creery case, that the English observers have been inattentive and unobservant in precisely the manner Mr. Davey's slate-writing tests render probable. In relying to the extent they have done upon watching with sustained attention, the English experimenters have again failed to come up to a scientific standard, and they leave fraud an open explanation for many of their results.

The English committee have sought to strengthen their case by calculating the probabilities of a given result, which they make out one in a million or trillion or more of chances. They forget that when we say a thing is improbable—meaning there is only one chance out of a large number of its occurring—we really assert that it is *certain to occur* some time. In this mathematical sense *Rien n'est sûr que l'imprévu* is an axiom. They forget also that the likelihood of an occurrence is estimated, not by the probability of a particular occurrence, but by the probable error of each observation. This is not the place for a lesson in mathematics, therefore it must suffice to merely allude to the fallacy of Mr. Gurney's estimate of the probabilities of thought-transference.

Our American experiments have been absolutely negative, though many thousands of trials have been made. In one case there was an indication of possible mind-reading of numbers, but

* *Proceed. Soc. Psychical Research*, Part XI., p. 381.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an analysis of the experiments enabled me to show that the guessing was the result of a number-habit,* not of thought-transference. Professor Pickering's ingenious study † of certain astronomical observations, where thought-transference might have come in, gave a negative result likewise.

After a thorough examination of the evidence adduced, I am brought to the conclusion that thought-transference, even as a hypothetical explanation, is a superfluous conception. It seems to me that the English committee have been seeking marvels and not the truth, and that they have found the marvel and not found the truth. Yet they deal with thought-transference as an established fact! but, one may well ask, can a natural fact be established by wishes and enthusiasm?

Having accepted thought-transference, the English authorities utilize it liberally to explain the appearances, known as phantasms now, and called apparitions and ghosts formerly. The fullest exposition is given to these views by Mr. Edmund Gurney in his bulky work on *Phantasms of the Living*, which is based on the material accumulated by the English Psychical Society. The majority of the material is formed by the stories of apparitions told by various persons, to confirm which an immense labor has been expended to secure corroborative evidence. This is presented as fully as possible, and the author and his collaborators have evidently striven to be candid, and have worked earnestly. The stories are nearly all very simple; a person perceives a figure of some individual with whom he is closely associated, usually by strong affection; the person is startled, either by the mere sight of the figure or by its look, or sometimes by a remark or two the apparition makes; in other cases merely the sound of the voice, generally making an appeal of some sort, is heard, and nothing is seen; the vision is always brief and almost always purposeless; frequently there is some peculiarity about the disappearance of the figure, which demonstrates that it could not have been a corporeal being; finally in a great many cases the time of the apparition coincides more or less closely with the time of death of the person whom the phantasm resembles.

There are two ways which a scientific man would naturally follow in studying the material presented in these stories, either

* *Proceed. American Soc. Psychical Research*, Vol. I., p. 86.
† *Proceed. American Society Psychical Research*, Vol. I., p. 35.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that of the psychologist or that of the ethnologist. Neither of these methods has been followed by Mr. Gurney and his colleagues. The psychologist would at once tabulate the results; determine the proportion of phantasms seen by men and women, their relation to the age of the percipient, the time of day, etc. He would have sought for every possible factor in the percipient's condition. I ventured to suggest to the late Mr. Gurney the importance of utilizing the material scientifically in such ways as have just been indicated, and was not a little surprised at his reply to the effect that this was not worth while, thought-transference being a demonstrated fact! The ethnologist would have studied the ghost stories of the various races of mankind and sought to ascertain whether English stories are more than survivals of the folk-lore and superstitions of ruder civilizations. In the proceedings of the American Society is a report showing that rudimentary superstitions still prevail to a great extent among educated New Englanders. That the stories in question are folk-lore survivals is, of course, *a priori*, the most probable explanation of their occurrence among us, and until that theory is set aside there is no occasion to advance any other. The fact that the stories are individual and personal is entirely in accordance with their being myths as well, while the further fact that the stories present scarcely any variety save of name, date, and place, the incidents being very uniform, emphatically suggests myth stories. Belief fixes what may happen in the way of marvel, something arouses the idea that the marvel is occurring, and inaccuracy of attention, of observation, and of memory completes the story to the proper scheme of the myth. The only way to effectively prove that the ethnologist's explanation of cotemporary phantasms is erroneous is to show that for other folk-lore stories, which are obviously untrue, there is no such evidence at all—and this has not been done. So far as I am aware the only attempt to do so is that of Mr. Gurney,* and his argument is, to my mind, worthless. He has studied through the literature of lycanthropy and like superstitions, and finds naturally no first-hand accounts. That conclusion is interesting, and corrects the false notion that there was more or less of such evidence; but it has little bearing on the question in hand. If Mr. Gurney had shown that there was no evidence of

* *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., p. 172–185.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

magic exerting effect on persons at a distance, or that there was no direct evidence of an astrological horoscope being fulfilled, he would have gained some defence for his position. Intelligent persons now believe that when magic worked or astrology was verified, it was an apparent result, and not due to magic or astrological factors acting as true causes. Such confirmations as occurred were due to coincidence. If it were proved that such coincidences were very rare, then if the confirmations of the cotemporary apparitions were proved to be much commoner, Mr. Gurney would have had a basis for his argument. It is the failure to meet the conditions of proof, which characterizes so much of the psychical research, appearing again.

Common intellectual prudence obliges us to hold to the folk-lore explanation of modern psychical stories, so far as mere actual chance coincidence is insufficient. Nothing has yet set aside this explanation, which, on the contrary, is favored by the illusions of memory to which Professor Royce has called attention. We must decline to accept thought-transference as probable, much less as proven, and it is at once unjustifiable and unnecessary to employ it to explain the phantasms of the dying, which appear to distant friends, by assuming that the dying man transfers the thought of himself to another's mind at a great distance.

Psychical research has not demonstrated either telepathy or the reality of ghosts. It has not raised them even to the rank of respectable hypotheses. I have devoted much time to these problems, for if the views advanced were correct their importance could not be overestimated. At first the weakness of the proof was not known. Now that the conclusions have become negative, I still do not regret the time spent in a vain search, for the mere recognition of error clears the way for truth.

The theosophical and psychical movements are akin in their origin, their development, and their failure: in their origin, because they were born from the love of the supernatural and the hope of discovering occult human faculties; in their development, because they grew outside the pale of strict scientific inquiry; and in their failure, because their conclusions are barren. They are far asunder in rank, for the theosophical movement lived on folly and imposture, while the psychical research movement lived on earnestness and honorable effort.

The failure of psychical research should teach us a profound

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lesson—the lesson that literary training sets limits to the faculties. The leaders of the Psychical Society are literary men, and have shown that, though they excel in literature, they have not the training to carry out a difficult scientific investigation. It is one thing to study books, but it is an utterly different thing to study nature. It is the difference between studying a tombstone and a living hero. Nature hides her facts in labyrinths of details; she is secretive and shrouds herself in mysteries. One who is accustomed to turn to a book and easily consult the desired page, cannot readily understand the precautions which are requisite to approach an unknown fact of nature. Years of special training are necessary to acquire the rudiments of this art. Of the qualities which those who investigate nature must possess, almost the first is humility, the willingness to accept what we find, without insisting on finding what we seek. Utter self-renunciation, when in the presence of a fact, is the first necessity of scientific investigation. In psychical research, as it exists to-day, we miss this trait, and in its place we find the pride of established convictions.

CHARLES SEDGWICK MINOT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE SECOND EMPIRE.

II.—THE OPPONENTS OF THE PRINCE-PRESIDENT.

BY ALBERT D. VANDAM, AUTHOR OF "AN ENGLISHMAN IN PARIS," "MY PARIS NOTE-BOOK," ETC., ETC.

In my previous chapter, I spoke of Princesse Mathilde as the prompter of Louis Napoleon before and after his election as President of the Second Republic. At the first blush that admission may appear a contradiction of my statement to the effect that the future Emperor was thoroughly aware of the magic potentiality contained in the name of Napoleon. But no actor, whether great or little, and however letter-perfect and certain of his audience, can afford to dispense with a prompter; for, known or unknown to the player, there may slip in among that audience a section hostile to him and bent upon "queering his pitch"—the expression is not elegant, but it is appropriate, as theatrical authorities will tell one. That section, numerous or the reverse, may work jointly or separately. It may post its members singly in different parts of the house or gather them into a serried phalanx, as was done during the "Tamburini Rows" at Her Majesty's Theatre more than fifty years ago.* It may express its hostility openly by hisses and catcalls, or by pretended and exaggerated marks of approval and sympathy. Nay, more; it may enlist in its cause a fellow-actor of the comedian to hamper him on the very stage.

To continue the theatrical metaphor for another moment. The members of that "omnibus-box," or, to use the French term,

* A word to the wise. The "Tamburini Rows" have been immortalized by Barham in the *Ingoldsby Legends*. But I cannot explain every allusion I may have occasion to use in the course of these articles. Many years ago I wrote in a preface to one of my books: "The writer who has time to explain everything has not much to write. The reader who is too indolent or indifferent to look up references ought not to read." I hold that opinion still.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"*loge infernale,*" who had determined to "queer Louis Napoleon's pitch," either in furtherance of their own and strictly personal aggrandisement or for the purpose of showing what an inferior "mummer" he, Louis Napoleon, was in comparison with the great classical actors they had selected for the part of rulers of the French—they, the members, all adopted the tactics enumerated just now. Among them, Lamartine is the only one entitled to a certain amount—a very small amount—of respect. He, at any rate, fought Louis Napoleon with uplifted visor, and would fain have avoided fighting altogether. The consciousness that his motive for fighting was not a lofty one may have bred the reluctance; for the poet-historian of *Les Girondins* had not an invincible conviction of his infallibility in all things, like the poet-pampleteer of *L'Histoire d'un Crime*, nor a facility for blinking unsavory facts connected with his own ambition, like the historian of *The Consulate and the Empire.* Lamartine was more honest and more honorable than either Victor Hugo or Adolphe Thiers, though that is not saying much. Joseph Méry, the friend of the elder Dumas and Balzac, the genial, amusing, and almost matchless humorist, who is scarcely known to English and American readers, but who ought to be known to every one, Méry, who rarely said an unkind word of any one, openly averred that Lamartine proclaimed the Second Republic on the 24th of February, 1848, as a means to stave off his most pressing creditors. Lamartine's subsequent explanation of his action on that day virtually substantiated Méry's indictment, for the poet admitted that at noon on that historical Thursday, "the establishment of a republic was farthest from his thoughts." But if he forsook his royalist faith, he was in no way pledged by any of his previous utterances either to Bonapartism in its ostentatious republican form as advocated by the "nephew of his uncle," or to republicanism in its Cæsaric form as interpreted by the "uncle of the nephew." Unlike Goethe, Heine, Byron, Hugo, and the rest, Lamartine had never worshipped at the shrine of the deified Corsican lieutenant of artillery; he had endeavored, though unsuccessfully, to drag down the idol and impose silence on its high-priests by that one, scathing line—

Rien d'humain ne battait sous son épaisse armure;

he had opposed the removal of Napoleon's remains from St.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Helena and their triumphal reception in Paris, and when defeated, his cry of surrender had been, as it were, prophetic. "Very well," he exclaimed, "bring back his remains, seeing that nothing less will satisfy you. Let the pedestal to his statue be the column ;* after all, the work is his, the monument created by him, but at any rate, do this: write on the socle, 'To NAPOLEON ALONE.'"

Thus, nearly a score of years before the *coup d'état*, Lamartine saw and felt whence and whither the wind blew. At that very moment the son of the great Napoleon was dying at Schoenbrunn; the second son of the great Napoleon's brother and Hortense de Beauharnais had died a twelvemonth before without issue; the least dangerous to the welfare of France, from Lamartine's point of view, and also the least enterprising were gone; the most daring, the mother and the third son, remained, and the poet-statesman guessed at, if he did not absolutely know, their temper. Louis Napoleon's attempt at Strasburg four years later (1836), his second attempt at Boulogne-sur-Mer four years after that (1840), and his writings during his subsequent confinement at Ham, could have left no doubt in Lamartine's mind with regard to Louis Napoleon's further plans; and Lamartine's first thought and care when the hour for the execution of these plans had obviously struck, was their frustration. On the 2nd March, 1848, Louis Napoleon and Lamartine met in secret; and the poet prevailed on the prince to return to England. Few of the real particulars of that interview, of the argument employed by Lamartine to induce Louis Napoleon to that step, have ever leaked out; I may honestly claim to possess some slight information on the subject, denied to others. Truly, that information is open to the charge of being one-sided, considering that it was gathered from the lips of the Emperor himself a couple of years after his accession, at what time a national subscription was set afoot to relieve Lamartine of his debts, to which fund the Emperor contributed a handsome sum.

"If he were the merest rhymester instead of being one of the greatest poets of contemporary France, I should still owe him that much," remarked Napoleon III. during one of those occasional con-

* The Austerlitz column, better, though wrongly, known as the Vendôme, whence the statue had been removed in 1814 after the entry of the Allied Troops into Paris. Lamartine's speech dates from 1852, when it was proposed to reinstate the statue.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

versations with my relatives to which I have alluded elsewhere.* "I owe him that much for his treatment of me in March, 1848. Neither Thiers nor Changarnier, and least of all Cavaignac, would have acted like that had they been in Lamartine's position. I feel certain they would not have counselled me to return to England, but opposed that return with all their might when once they had me in their power, for I was virtually setting at defiance the decree of banishment against our family, which had only been specially relaxed in favor of my uncle Jérôme and his children—a proof, by the bye, that Louis Philippe was not afraid of them and that he was afraid of me: so I could not have been the utter nonentity people said I was. I should not like to say for certain what Thiers or Changarnier would have done with me, though I have a pretty correct idea; as for Cavaignac, he would have had me shot as, I am sorry to say, my uncle had the Duc d'Enghien shot, that is, without the formality of a trial. Republican though he professed to be, he had all the making of an irresponsible tyrant in him; republican though he was, he would not have scrupled to pose as a kind of avenger of the son of the Duc de Condé, and, what is more, the people would have let him do it, even if he had condescended to apprise them of his intention. They would probably have applauded if they had only been told of the accomplished fact; first, because the masses are prone to applaud accomplished facts, or at any rate to acquiesce in them, provided they are accomplished boldly and promptly. If Louis XVI. had had the Tennis Court at Versailles surrounded and shelled instead of letting the proceedings take their course, there would have been no Revolution. Secondly, Cavaignac, if he had deigned to give a reason at all for thus disposing of me so unceremoniously, could have given an apparently valid one. He could have represented me as having come to overthrow the newborn Republic, and not with the intention of serving it as a French citizen. He might have been correct or not in that assertion, that is not the question. The people would have acquiesced, for it is a lie to say that the people side with the weaker; they side with the stronger, and during the first days of March, 1848, it was not only the people but the populace that had the upper hand, not the *bourgeoisie* as in 1830, although the people in 1848 allowed themselves to be hoodwinked by a set of

*My *Paris Note-Book*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the meanest and most contemptible *bourgeois* that ever lived. To this wholesale statement there are only two exceptions, Lamartine and Emile de Girardin, both of whom thoroughly despised the *bourgeois*. Lamartine's impecuniosity notwithstanding, there was not an ounce of greed in his composition; Girardin, in despite of his affluence, was not quite so indifferent to money, but his support of the Second Republic was due to other than money causes. There was, to begin with, a personal as well as a political feud between him and M. Guizot; apart from the resentment he felt against the whole of the aristocracy on account of the wrongs he had suffered at the hands of his father. *I take it,*" added the Emperor in a most significant tone, "*I take it to be more noble to father a child which one knows not to be one's own than to deny the flesh of one's flesh, the blood of one's blood, because it happens not to be born in holy wedlock.*" * He had, moreover, a grudge against Cavaignac for having given him a terrible fright, of which I will tell you one of these days.

"As for Changarnier," the Emperor went on, after a few moments, "he would have done with me what the Bourbons did with Ney; that is, given me a public trial, a kind of spectacular melodrama in some specially constituted court, and in which he would have endeavored to run me very hard as the hero of the play, for he was conceited and idiotic enough for anything, and as long as he succeeded in drawing public attention to himself, he would not have minded drawing public attention to me. What Victor Hugo would have done in Lamartine's stead, it is impossible for me to say. He might have treated me as he treated his imaginary opponents in the Chamber, viz., credited me with sentiments and projects altogether foreign to my heart and mind, in order to 'place' an eloquent speech. He might have had me tried and sentenced to death for the sake of writing another immortal *Dernier Jour d'un Condamné*; I might have become at his pen *le plus grand des Napoléons*, instead of *Napoléon le Petit*, but my posthumous greatness would have been less useful to me and to France than my actual littleness. All nonsense apart," the Emperor interrupted himself with a smile, "I am not at all sorry that I incurred the enmity of Victor Hugo, though I

* The first part of the sentence in italics is unquestionably an allusion to the frequent doubts cast upon Louis Napoleon's own legitimacy; the second, a condemnation of the conduct of General Alexis de Girardin with regard to his natural son. General de Girardin did not behave well to him even after he had "legitimized" his "love-child."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yield to no man in my admiration of him as a poet. But I did not want a constant repetition of Boileau's line to Louis XIV.—'*Cessez de vaincre, sire, ou je cesse d'écrire*;' and I should have inevitably had that line over and over again if I had retained his friendship. The age of the *Roi Soleil* is passed, probably never to return as far as the fulsome and non-critical worship of a ruler is concerned. The poet has had to make room for the historian and leader-writer, especially in regard to living sovereigns. The poet who would endeavor to drown critical appreciation with indiscriminate panegyrics of the sovereign thus criticised, would most likely drag that sovereign into the current with him; at any rate he would make him look ridiculous; and in France ridicule maims when it does not kill, especially if it be leveled at a civilian; and according to a great many, I was only a civilian, and a sorry one at that.

"What Thiers would have done with me had he been in Lamartine's place, I repeat, it is equally impossible for me to say," the Emperor went on. "I have often tried to think it out, but must frankly confess that I dared not pursue my thoughts to their logical conclusion. I am certainly not less prone than others to think evil of my fellow-men, but I fancy there is a tacit compact between my mind and my heart—say, between my understanding and my conscience—to find extenuating circumstances for an enemy, and that Thiers is my personal enemy, to an even greater extent than my political one, I have not the faintest doubt. I sometimes think that if Thiers had had the disposal of me at that time, there would have been neither a summary execution as in the case of Cavaignac, nor a public trial as in the case of Changarnier or Hugo, but a kind of *escamotage*. I should have disappeared, whether temporarily or permanently would have depended on circumstances. There might have been a second mystery of the 'Iron Mask' in history, for Thiers is a mental and moral as well as a physical coward who would not have had the pluck to resort to secret assassination, and there was no Lady Macbeth by his side to screw his courage to the sticking point. Cavaignac is a brute, but has the courage of the brute. Changarnier has courage also; it is not the courage of Henri IV., of whom it was said, '*Son courage riait*;' Changarnier's courage grins rather than laughs, and is more or less theatrical, like that of the Prince de Condé, who opened the trenches at Lérida to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sound of a score of violins; it is the dandy courage of some of the captains under Louis XIV., but it is courage for all that. Nor is Victor Hugo a coward. 'Show me how a man sings and I will tell you how he will fight,' Carlyle, whom you admire so much, has said; and I fancy the axiom is generally though not invariably true. Enough. All these men, Lamartine included, have courage; Thiers, I repeat, has none. His 'courage' spells 'craft.' Lamartine had the courage to show me indirectly that he was afraid of me, by advising me to return to England. I say indirectly, for he did not put it in that way; he alleged that there was danger to me, not to him; but his fear strengthened my courage; and that is why I owe him a good turn, which I have endeavored to repay by heading the national subscription for the settlement of his debts with a handsomer sum than I would have given had he been simply the great poet he is."

This, then, was Louis Napoleon's opinion of the men with whom he had engaged in that game of political bluff which lasted for more than three years, though only two kept playing to the last. Lamartine threw up his hand almost directly after the first deal, *i. e.*, when he had objected to Louis Napoleon's joining the game at all —and found that Louis Napoleon meant to join it in spite of his objection; in other words, that neither intrigue nor threats would keep him out of France.* For, immediately after the disturbances in June,† during which Cavaignac had virtually given himself away by showing the kind of game he meant to play henceforward, Louis Napoleon slipped into Paris while the streets around the Northern Railway station were still encumbered with the remains of the barricades. "I was compelled to leave my luggage in the cloakroom and to make my way on foot to the house of my friend who had offered me his hospitality. I only carried a very small carpet-bag," said the Emperor afterwards, when recounting the incidents of his arrival. "I had scarcely gone a hundred yards when I was stopped by an old woman. 'I say, young man,' she cried, 'just put a paving stone or so in its place; help us to get a bit straight; as you see we are all at sixes and sevens, some one must put an end to the confusion.' 'That's exactly what I have come here for, madame,' I replied. The old

* The order for Louis Napoleon's arrest, transmitted by telegraph to every prefect and sub-prefect in France on the 12th of June, 1848, and posted up in every commune almost immediately afterwards.

† Not to be confounded with the revolt of June, 1849, which was quelled by Changarnier.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

woman did not know how absolutely true these words were; I myself have often pondered them since, and invariably been reminded in connection with them of that incident in Edmund Kean's life when he trudged to Drury Lane in the snow on the night of his first appearance on that stage which was to witness his greatest triumphs."

Cavaignac's first and practically last hand was a bad one from the outset; nevertheless he "came in" and drew cards, trusting first to his own faculty for "bluffing"; secondly, to that same faculty as displayed by those who were betting on his hand; namely, the whole of the staff of *Le National*, founded eighteen years previously by Thiers and Armand Carrel and edited at the period of which I treat by Armand Marrast. That staff ought to have been warned, by the fate of one of the founders of the paper (Armand Carrel), of the danger of excessive "bluffing," nay, of the mortal penalty attached to such "bluffing." But a few months of phenomenal sneers in that respect had made them absolutely reckless. *Le National* literally governed France for a little while,* and its members fancied they would be allowed to continue governing, if Cavaignac should succeed in his candidature for the Presidency. Neither their bluffing, though, nor that of Lamoricière and Dufaure, who were staking on Cavaignac's game with the moneys of the state, was of much avail; the game was lost to them before Louis Napoleon had said that he would "see" Cavaignac's hand. "Your candidate does not stand the ghost of a chance," wrote an electioneering canvasser from the provinces whither he had been sent by Lamoricière. "Even his name is against him." "Cavaignac, Cavaignac," said an elector, "Cavaignac means nothing at all to Frenchmen. You say he has been in Africa; but I never heard of him. If his name were Geneviève de Brabant or that of one of the four sons of Aymon,† it might do; it would convey some kind of story, but, I repeat, that of Cavaignac conveys nothing at all. I prefer that of Napoleon; there is a ring about it; it arouses echoes in one's mind and heart, the echoes of battle-marches to which our fathers and grandfathers went to victory at Jena, at Austerlitz, at Marengo. To defeat also, as at

* See *An Englishman in Paris*, vol. ii., chap. i., where there is a list of the government appointments held by the members, literary and otherwise, of *Le National* in the beginning of 1848.

† The four knights of a Carlovingian legend who were mounted on *one* horse named Bayard.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Waterloo, as you say." This in answer to a timid remark of mine. "Well, yes, Waterloo was a defeat; a defeat more glorious, perhaps, than a victory; but your General Cavaignac won't retrieve it, and a second Napoleon may." "I am afraid," concluded the agent, "that eleven-twelfths of the electors hold a similar opinion." As will be seen from this, the Boucards and Latapies had done their work; the Napoleonic legend which they had sown broadcast was blossoming into fruit.

Changarnier scarcely played at all in that first deal. He made good his "ante" and drew four cards to a king;* but those cards were not sufficiently good to admit of his betting, and before his turn for betting came he had flung them away, determined to "sit tight" for a while and not to "come in" except on a good hand, when he would bluff on sure grounds.

Different from Changarnier's tactics were those of Hugo and Thiers, neither of whom played at all in that first deal; but sat watching the game, or rather one player, Louis Napoleon, in order to get at his system.† They might as well have watched Kaempfler's automatic chess-player for all the information they did get. Hugo, a short time after the first deal had been won by Louis Napoleon, on the 10th December, 1848, practically gave up all idea of playing. Not so Thiers, and for the next three years the game becomes virtually a three-handed one between the Prince-President, the erstwhile Minister of Louis Philippe, and the General whom Marshal Bugeaud once compared to the pack-horse of the Maréchal de Saxe, but who fondly imagined himself to be a second Napoleon I., not only sword in hand, but pen in hand, and especially in speech. We shall meet with him again, and fill in the outlines of his portrait as given by the Emperor. It is time to look at Thiers, "the great Thiers" as some of the French journalists continue to call him; the same journalists who dispute the adjective "great" to Bismarck "by reason of his craft," although the ex-Chancellor would have scorned to resort to a single one of the mean shifts which crop up daily, nay, hourly, in the life of the French so-called statesman of whom, moreover, it is

* The Comte de Chambord. There is no doubt that the 4,687 votes polled by Changarnier at the Presidential elections were given by isolated Legitimists in batches of two, three, and four. They, the voters, saw in him a would-be Monk of another Bourbon Restoration.

† It is worthy of record that among the stray votes at the Presidential elections there were not a dozen for either Thiers or Hugo. Thiers, for reasons that will appear directly, had not even come forward as a candidate. Hugo never had a desire to become President of the Republic, but coveted the portfolio of Foreign Affairs.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difficult to record one private or political action sufficiently generous to throw a lasting ray of light in the otherwise sombre picture.

Of course, I am not going to write Thiers' biography. I cannot too often remind the reader that I lay no claim to the title of historian or to that of biographer. I would, moreover, state, once for all, that, notwithstanding the many assertions to the contrary of both friendly and unfriendly critics, I hold no brief for the late Emperor of the French, and that least of all have I been engaged as the Devil's Advocate against the memory of the first President of the Third Republic. The French Republicans may canonize him and Gambetta and Favre for what I care, and if they want another trio of such saints as "understudies" I will give them a long list from which to choose. This much I do say: whenever and wherever historians put the memory of Napoleon III. on its trial for the calamities that resulted to France from the Franco-German War, the memory of Thiers ought to stand arraigned by the side of the other as *an accessory* before the fact. Lest this should appear an unfounded accusation on my part, I will proceed at once to give chapter and verse. At least two of the actors in that particular prologue to the War are alive. They have the option of contradicting me.

One morning in the early part of June, 1870, hence more than a month before the declaration of war between France and Germany, the Emperor, being then at St. Cloud, was strolling gently along that large avenue of sycamores situated opposite the windows of his private apartments on the ground floor of the palace. The disease from which he had been suffering for several years, and which was eventually to carry him to his grave, had reached an acute stage; nevertheless on that morning he was more or less free from pain. By his side walked his kinswoman, the Duchesse de Mouchy (*née* Princesse Anna Murat), who had only arrived a few minutes previously, and joined him thus informally at her own request, as she had an important communication to make. It was to the following effect. That same morning, M. Thiers, through the intermediary of the Marquis Philippe de Massa, had requested an interview with her. She, the Duchesse, was to prevail upon the Emperor to grant Thiers a private audience. "What can M. Thiers want with the Emperor?" the Duchesse had exclaimed in a tone of sur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prise. The surprise was not unjustified, considering that M. Thiers at that time was not only the avowed enemy of the Empire, but of the Emperor himself. She was less surprised at Thiers' selection of an ambassador in the shape of a captain of a crack regiment of dragoons, and personally attached to the Emperor. The second husband of the marquis' mother was the Comte Roger (du Nord), a consistent Republican, and an intimate friend of Thiers, at whose house the Comtesse spent many evenings, and whither her son accompanied her now and then. The Emperor could be vindictive enough, but his vindictiveness was, at the best, sporadic, and he often swallowed a camel in the shape of an offence while straining at a gnat. He never forgave Lady Jersey for having poohpoohed his request for the hand of her daughter; he sent David d'Angers into exile for having refused to finish the tomb of Queen Hortense; while he condoned, as I will show in the course of these pages, much graver injuries against himself. Adam Smith has said somewhere that people will sooner tolerate the enemies of their friends than the friends of their enemies. Louis Napoleon was the exception; he showed no resentment against the friends of his enemies, but he would scarcely have tolerated the enemies of his friends. Thiers, on the other hand, knew no such generosity; he tolerated the enemies of his friends—if he could get something by it—while it is doubtful whether he would have welcomed the friend of an enemy. In this instance, Napoleon III. did not object to his young ordnance officer visiting the house of Thiers; Thiers, on the other hand, would not have admitted him for a moment, but for his constant hope of worming some more or less important secret out of a charming and accomplished dragoon who had virtually the run of the Tuileries. It could scarcely be otherwise with one bearing the name of Régnier. In view of all this, the Duchesse de Mouchy, though surprised at Thiers' request, was not surprised at his choice of the ambassador.

In reply to the Duchesse's question, M. de Massa gave some additional information. "M. Theirs," he said, "wishes you to tell the Emperor that a near, nay, impending, war between France and Prussia is unavoidable; that, to carry on this war successfully the Emperor will require men of tried knowledge and experience instead of the incapable ones of which the Ollivier Cabinet is composed; that the Emperor will require, above all,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

popular men who have the ear and confidence of the nation, and that, under the circumstances, he is ready and willing to form a ministry under his own leadership."

The Duchesse pondered for a moment. "You are right," she remarked at last; "the news is indeed very important and serious, but before I can communicate it to the Emperor, I must have M. Thiers' personal permission." M. de Massa at once saw the force of the remark. He went away immediately and in less than half an hour returned, accompanied by Thiers, who not only repeated what M. de Massa had said, but pointed out to the Duchesse the necessity of her seeing the Emperor at once. So anxious, in fact, was Thiers to set the matter going that he offered to stay at the Duchesse's while she proceeded to St. Cloud. Here again we have particulars which will remove the faintest doubt as to the absolute truth of the whole affair. Among other precious autographs she had a collection of letters from Fénelon to her husband's kinswoman (the Vicomtesse de Noailles), during the great controversy between the famous Archbishop of Cambray and Bossuet. Thiers asked permission to examine them while awaiting her return.

The Emperor had listened to the Duchesse without interrupting her by as much as a word; he had only smiled, with one of those ineffable smiles which, to his friends, needed no interpretation, which all the misinterpretation of his enemies failed to rob of their charm. When she had quite finished, he led the way to his room, still in silence. "My dear Anna," he said, when they were seated, "this is not the first nor the second time M. Thiers has made similar overtures to me under one pretext or another. But very recently, Madame Colonna* came to offer me his co-operation to found the parliamentary *régime*. I may frankly tell you that I have not much faith in nor much sympathy with this very meddlesome, arbitrary, and irrepressible personage. I have a distinct recollection of his tactics in the early days of the Presidency. He positively pervaded the Elysée. Each morning he came, as it were, to settle with me—in reality for me—my programme for the day; he brought me my speeches, practically his speeches, ready written out; in short, he endeavored to interfere in everything. He had to have a finger in every pie; no ques-

* Adèle, Princesse Colonna di Castiglioni, *née* d'Affry, better known to the world at large under her artistic pseudonym of "Marcello" the sculptor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion was to be discussed or decided without him.* More than twenty years have passed since the ceremony of inauguration of the chief magistracy, but I remember very vividly his look of stupefaction and anger, when on the morning of that day I gave him back the manuscript of a speech he had composed for me, telling him at the same time that, though deeply grateful for his counsels and his arduous interest in me, I intended henceforth to manage my own affairs. Our estrangement and his frenzied opposition date from that morning. I have been told that journeymen bakers suffer excruciating pains in their muscles, when an accident compels them to leave off kneading the dough. M. Thiers suffers similarly from being bereft of power, from being no longer the arbiter of the Government. His restless opposition is in reality the acute St. Vitus's dance of inactivity. But for that St. Vitus's dance he would be dead. Nevertheless, in view of the grave events with which we may be confronted at any moment, I would recall him to power, if I thought he could be useful. I do not say that such a step would afford me pleasure, for I do not like the man and have no reason to like him; but it would give me no pain. Unfortunately, I am no longer the master in that respect. I have taken in earnest to my part of a constitutional ruler, and will not depart from it. The actual Ministry commands considerable majority in both Chambers; to dismiss this Ministry abruptly and without a valid motive, would be an act of personal interference which I must no longer commit. If, at some future period, near or distant, the Chamber should overthrow M. Ollivier's cabinet on an interpellation of M. Thiers or on an important question, I might entrust M. Thiers with the task of constituting a Ministry; but at present I am bound to attempt nothing against a Minister who appears to enjoy the confidence of Parliament. Pray thank M. Thiers for me, and tell him that, while deeply obliged for his warning and trouble, I cannot, at any rate for the present, accept his proposal. He is an old and experienced parliamentarian, and

* "And in fact, up till 1830, when he was nearly forty-four, he (Guizot) had never seen the sea. 'And if it had not been for an electoral journey to Normandy, I might not have seen it then,' he said. I pointed out to him that M. Thiers had never had a country house; that he did not seem to care for nature, for birds, or for flowers. 'Ah, that's different,' he smiled. 'I did not care for the country, because I had never seen it. Thiers does not like it, because the birds, the flowers, the trees, live and grow without his interference, and he does not care that anything on earth should happen without his having a hand in it.'"—*An Englishman in Paris*, vol. ii., ch. 2.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will no doubt understand and appreciate the motives that prompt my conduct."

Whether Thiers understood the motives of the Emperor's refusal of his services or not, it is certain that he failed to appreciate them; for when the Duchesse de Mouchy, on her return to her house in the Parc Monceau, gave him the Emperor's answer—toned down, we may be sure, and shorn of the sovereign's prefatorial remarks as to Thiers' character—Thiers flew into a towering rage, stamped his feet and bounced out of the room, exclaiming in that shrill treble of his: "Is that it? He does not want me. He'll find to his cost that he does want me. And then I'll not want him."

I will show later on how Thiers kept his word. I anticipated the story of events in order to prove that at no time of his career was Louis Napoleon the dupe of Thiers, not even immediately before and during the miscarried attempt at Boulogne when the future Emperor issued a decree appointing his enemy—for he always knew Thiers to be such—chief of the Provisional Government. Thiers, in spite of everything that has been said about his marvellous intuition and the rest, was, at times, absolutely purblind to the effect of his duplicity and craft upon others. Out of that duplicity and craft he had woven around himself a fabric so thick as to be literally impenetrable from the inside, and he fondly imagined that those outside could not espy his actions. He was a bad sportsman, or he would have known that the experienced hunter watches the dense undergrowth that hides the wild brute, and not the wild brute itself, which in reality he cannot see, whose movements are only revealed to him by signs imperceptible, by sounds inaudible to the inexperienced, but of whose presence in that undergrowth he is nevertheless practically certain, because he has "tracked" his quarry thither, guided by the devastation the latter has spread around in its course, by the blood of his victims. Thiers' track was positively reeking with the blood of his victims, the blood of the Republicans whom he had pitted against the Bourbons in 1830, against the d'Orléans in '48; it was bestrewn with the maimed remains of two dynasties, and yet he fancied that he would secure another victim in Louis Napoleon, whom he had already endeavored to kill physically, if possible; politically, if failing in the other attempt, eight years before the latter's advent to the Presidency. I am referring once

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more to the affair at Boulogne, which every one was agreed in saying was a trap laid by the little man for the son of Queen Hortense. What every one did not and does not know is this. Prince Louis suspected it to be a trap, though he did not expect it to close upon him, as it did, for six years. I have by me several notes referring to private remarks on that subject by the Emperor, which preclude all doubts as to Prince Louis Napoleon's mental grasp of the whole situation. Their reproduction here, even in the most condensed form, is unfortunately out of the question. These notes show conclusively: 1. That Louis Napoleon fostered few illusions with regard to the success of the projected Boulogne attempt; 2. That had he considered it to be even more of a forlorn hope than he did consider it, he would still have attempted it, because he wished to draw attention to himself at any cost, and because his financial position was almost desperate. Of two things, one would assuredly happen: he would be tried in some superior court and his name would be on every Frenchman's lips; or if Louis Philippe was still frightened of untoward revelations with regard to the influence of the Napoleonic legend, as he had been in 1836, he would send Louis Napoleon out of the country once more with a decent sum of money; 3. The appointment of Thiers as chief of the Provisional Government meant nothing in the event of Louis Napoleon's success. That appointment could be rescinded at the first convenient opportunity; for even as early as 1840, Louis Napoleon had no intention of affording Thiers the smallest chance of reducing to practice, in his (Louis Napoleon's) case, the formula Thiers had invented in order to lord it over Louis Philippe: "The king reigns, but does not govern." The notes of these conversations bear no particular dates, only the years in which they took place are mentioned. Those to which I am referring just now more specially are labelled 1853, hence a few months after Thiers' return from exile; at which time the empire was settling down to its new position, and when, as some critics might remark, "the Emperor could afford to pretend to be wise after the event." That Napoleon III. pretended to no such wisdom, that he would not have intrusted Thiers with a portfolio at no matter what period of his presidential or imperial career will be sufficiently patent from the following fact. During the Odilon-Barrot Ministry, the opposition of Thiers became so utterly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unbearable that the Premier had him and several members of his faction summoned to the Elysée, and at the end of the interview proposed that Thiers himself should form a Ministry. Thiers declined the offer and for very good reasons, for after he was gone, the Prince-President turned to Barrot: "Do you imagine, my dear Minister," he said, "that if M. Thiers had taken you at your word and consented to accept a portfolio, *I* would have consented to intrust him with one? If you entertained such an idea for a single moment, you must have been strangely mistaken in me."

No; a thousand times no; Louis Napoleon never for one single instant mistook Thiers' character or intentions. He knew the value of Thiers' agitation in favor of the removal of his uncle's remains from St. Helena to Paris, which agitation was coincident with the publication of the *History of the Consulate and the Empire*; consequently an enormous self-advertisement for the author; he also knew the reasons that had prompted the laying of the trap at Boulogne. If in the face of all this he appointed Thiers the chief of the Provisional Government, it was to meet craft with craft. If the expedition had been successful, the appointment would have been rescinded; the expedition failing as it did, it simply discredited Thiers in the eyes of the adherents of Louis Philippe, for there were letters to prove that Thiers had not been thus appointed without his knowledge or against his will. Louis Napoleon made many mistakes in his life; he never made a mistake with regard to Thiers' potentiality or goodwill to him and his dynasty.

Thiers, on the other hand, made few mistakes from his own point of view, and fewer still in pursuit of the aim of his life, which was, as M. Charles Merruau, who knew him better than any one, expressed it, "to found a Conservative Republic and to marry *her* in the capacity of President." But he made a terrible mistake in his estimate of Louis Napoleon's potentiality before and after his election to the Presidency. One single instance among a hundred will bear out my contention. Immediately after the insurrection of June, '49, Thiers, frantic with apprehension, ran to his stockbroker, yelling to him, "Sell all my securities." "Leave them alone," said the other quietly; "Napoleon will save you all from spoliation and bankruptcy." "He!" exclaimed Thiers, scornfully, "he is too great an imbecile!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This was the man with whom the Prince-President had to contend in and out of the Chamber. Was the game equal? Yes, and it would have remained equal during the Empire if the Emperor had trusted to himself alone. Even in 1849–1851 the game was equal, though at the beginning of that period Louis Napoleon had scarcely an ally in that Chamber. When Dupin *aîné* and Morny joined the small group of his apparently faithful partisans, the game was practically half won or they would not have joined. But they, as well as those who completed the victory—Persigny, Fleury, Maupas, Saint-Arnaud, Dr. Véron, and the rest—must be described in the next chapter.

ALBERT D. VANDAM.

(*To be continued.*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

IMAGES IN DEAD EYES.

THE art of photography has done much to aid in suppressing crime and in detecting counterfeits of various kinds, but it cannot yet do all which an enthusiastic but not well informed public ascribe to it.

A statement has very recently gone the rounds of the newspapers of the country, that the image of a man, presumably the murderer, had been found in the eyes of a woman lying dead, and who had unquestionably thus met her fate. The eyes, after careful removal from the body, were hurried off to the nearest photographer's, and an attempt made to secure the portrait of the murderer by photographing them—or their retinæ—which in this case amounts to the same thing. The newspaper accounts, however differing about all the rest of the affair, are perfectly unanimous in saying that the photographic efforts were not crowned with success.

It has long been the habit of scientists to draw comparisons between the human eye and the photographic camera as optical instruments, and they may be thus stated: The light enters through an aperture of varying size (pupil of the eye, diaphragm of the photographic lens) standing in front of a lens which forms the image. This image is received on a suitable medium at the back of the instrument (the retina in the eye, the sensitive plate in the camera); and this is all. No further parallelisms can be drawn between them as optical instruments.

What a pity it is for enthusiasts in science, for persons fond of the horrible, and for those who conduct medico-legal investigations in such murder cases as we are speaking of, that we cannot go a step further in the above parallelism. If we could only say that the "visual purple" or rhodopsin in the retina is the sensitive medium that is quick to catch and preserve the scowling lineaments of the godless villain as he withdraws his bloody hand after the fatal blow; if we could only say that the microscope, the solar camera, and the developer were ready and waiting to put his abhorred features into visible form to show to the jury! But we can *not* say so, and the reasons are quite simple. In the first place, there is no sensitive material like photographic preparations on the retina that can seize and retain such an image as that of a man in an ordinary room. An experiment was once made which indeed points in the desired direction, but stops far short of what is necessary. A man, sentenced to be hanged, was kept in darkness a short time before being led out to the scaffold. He then looked fixedly at a certain building until the black cap shut out all light. The drop was sprung, and when the man was dead a microscopical examination was made of the eyes. In each of them

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was found an image of the building, inverted, of course, and uncertain in formation, because of the irregularity of the retina on which the image was impressed.

The "retaining power" of the retina has long been known. Such toys as those in which, for instance, the figure of a man sawing wood are drawn in parts, so that, when rapidly revolved, the figure seems to perform the act, are based upon this principle. Modern photography has given us some wonderful things of the kind. But the power in question is a very limited one. It will be seen in the above experiment that the object was well defined and brightly illuminated, and that the eyes were fixed upon it for a considerable time. No such thing ever could take place at the time of a murder. The "visual purple" is not an exquisitely sensitive substance like photographic bromide of silver. If it were, we should be blind from the retained images of numerous objects all confused and mixed up on the retina. And, again, even granting the absurdity of the murderer's image being actually there in visible form on the retina, how could it be photographed? I have struggled with many a difficult subject in practical photography, but I should not like to grapple with one like this. It must be borne in mind that the retina is not flat, but is a *concave surface*. How to successfully photograph such an image on such a surface I do not know.

ELLERSLIE WALLACE, M. D.

NEWSPAPER ROW AND NATIONAL LEGISLATION.

LEGISLATION is naturally influenced by public opinion. Newspapers reflect and, in a smaller degree, mould it. The Washington correspondent gives the public his views, or those of the paper he represents, and often voices the sentiments of his own party leaders. There is little non-partisanship in journalism. The correspondent not unnaturally, often unwittingly, and sometimes purposely, colors situations. His writings mirror his own ideas or prejudices. His attitude on a public question is often peculiar to himself. It is generally dictated by the policy of the paper he represents. That depends on his personality and the degree of confidence imposed by his editor on his judgment. Usually the correspondent influences his paper and is affected by it. If he has served it for a length of time his ideas and those of the paper become the same. He generally writes what he believes. He is ordinarily a man of strong convictions, often pessimistic and cynical by reason of his experiences with the more selfish side of life.

The average of honesty and integrity among correspondents is high. It equals that of any profession. They do not lobby, though there may have been isolated cases of it. Necessarily they often unknowingly misrepresent because of a lack of details, or incorrect information, sometimes given them by interested parties, for some Congressmen and Senators are not above using deceit for their own ends. Instances could be cited where they have misdirected newspaper men, seeking to create a favorable or hostile public impression of pending legislation.

There is great temptation to paint a story and make it picturesque, to romance a little, that the despatch may be the more interesting. It is the hardest tendency to resist, but it is no more unusual than the habit in ordinary life. As a rule the correspondent seeks to do right, to be fair. His work is hasty and under stress. He must judge on slight evidence, hear a thing, get new details, and often assume the rest. A suggestion sets a train

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of thought working, a conclusion is reached on a premise that may have seemed insignificant. Study of character, of legislation, of past events, of their sequence, of history, experience guides him in his judgment. He is oftener correct than inaccurate. When he errs he as a rule is quick to correct it. Though a newspaper correspondent, wittingly or unwittingly, misrepresents a public man or question, colors a story, or is unjust, the truth becomes known sooner or later. He may elevate a man temporarily or lower him. If a man be given the wrong place in public estimation, the error rights itself after a while. The weakness and incompetency of a man or his dishonesty soon become known if he be exalted too much. His honesty and ability are assigned their proper niche in public estimation if he is improperly placed. The newspaper correspondent serves to make a public man's abilities apparent or his shallowness known.

A legislator is benefited by being a "newsman." That does not mean a man who tells all he knows, gabbles, and gossips about without thought or reason. The unreliable gossip is discredited. A newsman is one who knows what news is, how to tell it tersely to the correspondent, who is frequently superficial in his study of a public question. If an official be courteous, thoughtful, communicative, accurate, he is appreciated on the "Row" and receives many favors, for a newspaper man is human. He welcomes a courtesy, and returns it when possible. No favor is greater than the giving of information. The newsman, if he speaks, is given better attention. If he introduces a bill, it is noticed. Whatever he does attracts the newspaperman's eye and is referred to in his despatches. The haughty, secretive, mysterious, discourteous, thoughtless man does not have that fate. He is not necessarily, though he often is, attacked. Unless he does something to merit it, he receives but perfunctory consideration. This is often unkind, but it is natural.

Washington correspondents have never combined in favor of legislation. They have several times joined to defeat men whose conduct or animosity to them seemed to justify it. A Speaker was once driven to private life and a Vice-President defeated for renomination by reason of such a union, and there have been other instances of the use of power. If the Press Gallery united in favor of any proposition its power would be immense. Though there was no unison of action almost every correspondent last session attacked a trust showing its attempt to dictate legislation favorable to itself. The voice of the "Row" is cast for honesty in legislation. The fear of exposure has undoubtedly prevented much fraud. If the newspaper men discover a job they attack it. They have saved the United States many a dollar in that way. Sometimes they do not see it and at others think they see a job where there is none.

The correspondent deals little with the personal life of the public man. He overlooks his weaknesses unless they be flagrant or the man poses as a great reformer and is a demagogue, or claims to be a "Christian statesman" and is a hypocrite. If he ascertains a man can be bribed, is dishonest, he exposes him and follows him relentlessly. Possibly he is not sufficiently charitable. Sometimes he is too much so. His estimates of men are sometimes wrong, but oftener right.

Correspondents are all patriotic. Faith is always kept by a newspaper man. He must have the confidence of those with whom he deals or his usefulness to the paper he represents is destroyed. He must be ready to lose his position rather than break faith; resist the temptation to publish a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

story if given him confidentially, no matter how interesting or important it be. To keep a secret is his religion. If a man is known to be untrustworthy, if he reveals what is told him for personal information and not for publication, he might as well leave Washington. His own fellows shun him and will not confer with him, while the politician refuses to talk with him. The keeping of faith is the best policy, and it is natural to most newspaper men

Discussion of public questions is frequently, probably generally, started by the correspondent. He interviews the legislator, and makes public his ideas. He stirs the waters. The people do the additional thinking, and are swift to see the meat of the thing. They scent newspaper injustice, discover misrepresentation, and discount partisan coloring, generally getting the correct view of a question, or the proper estimate of a man.

To a greater or less extent the correspondent influences legislation. The exact measure of it cannot be estimated. That depends greatly on the character of the correspondent, his experience, grasp of affairs, the acuteness of his understanding, accuracy, fairness, ability to forecast happenings, and to judge of the influence of seeming trifles by others and the history of legislation. The greater the paper a man represents, the larger its circulation, the better its representation, the wider its influence and that of its representative. The voice of the "Row" is for the most part beneficial. Unfair partisanship and "faking" injure the correspondent and destroy his power. To be influential he must be of good reputation. Newspapers are widely read in Washington. They convey information to the public man as they do to his constituents. The attitude of the paper or its correspondent, measured by its character, if it be from his district, guides the public man to a degree. New men are more sensitive to criticism. Old ones get blunted. A correspondent's influence on legislation—the power of the "Row"—cannot be measured. It is greatest as representing public opinion. It is frequently overestimated. Care, courage, accuracy, are requisite. The newspaper man's errors are remembered and his accuracies generally forgotten. His influence on legislation depends on himself.

ALBERT HALSTEAD.

THE CAT IN LAW.

THE learned Attorney-General of the State of Maryland has recently struck a cruel blow at the cat, which is calculated to deprive that harmless and necessary domestic animal of its inalienable rights. It came about in this wise. A certain citizen of Baltimore stole a fine Maltese cat from a neighbor, who had him arrested for theft. When the case came up for trial the prisoner's counsel entered the plea that it was impossible for anyone to steal a cat, as that animal is not property, and that to take forcible possession of a feline, even though it be a pet one and wear a ribbon and answer to its name, is not a legal offence. The judge held this argument to be good, and the Attorney-General, to whom the case was appealed, agreed with him. The latter in his formal opinion, declares that the cat is really nothing but a wild animal, that it is of no use to man, and that the taking of a cat without the consent of its owner is not an indictable offence. Commenting on this opinion, one newspaper says:

"The eminent lawyer who has made this cruel decision must have passed a wild and reckless boyhood in which hours and days and nights were spent in chas-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing Thomas and Tabby over back fences and through vacant lots. In no other way can his decision be explained."

It is at least certain that this decision, which leaves the cat impoverished and ownerless, is one that goes home to every household, not only in the City of Hills, but throughout the whole country. It behooves us, therefore, to look into the question and to see what claims, if any, the cat has upon the sympathy of the community.

Looking backward we find that pussy has been the pet and favorite of some of the most famous personages in history. Mahomet rather chose to cut off the sleeve of his robe than to disturb a cat lying upon it; and his followers, who have no more objugatory term for the Christian than dog, admit it into their mosques. Dante and Petrarch each had a fondness for it, and the great Richelieu had a pet cat, while Cardinal Wolsey placed his favorite tabby near him on a chair whilst exercising his judicial functions. Sir Isaac Newton had a pet cat and kitten, and it is recorded that the worthy philosopher had two holes cut in the door for their convenience, the larger one for the cat and the other for the kitten. Montaigne, too, was not too witty or too cynical but the frolics of a cat would amuse him; and La Belle Stuart, a famous beauty in the reign of Charles II., satirized by Pope in the line well known—

"Die and endow a college or a cat,"

left annuities to several of her friends on condition of their caring for and maintaining her cats. Among contemporary celebrities, Ellen Terry loves to disport herself with her cats, and to amuse herself with their mad capers. Edmund Yates was a noted cat fancier. Both Renan and Taine possessed an extravagant fondness for cats, and Francois Coppée, who, since the death of Victor Hugo, has been generally classed as the leading poet of contemporary France, also shares this hobby in a marked degree. Cats surround his desk and nibble at his pen while he writes, and his friends can recite a dozen poems which he has composed in honor of these pets.

Had it not been for the services rendered by his cat, Dick Whittington would never have been Lord Mayor of London. We all remember how that poor orphan country lad, having heard that London was "paved with gold," went there to get a living. When reduced to starving point, a rich merchant gave him employment in his kitchen with the cook, but the cook so ill-treated him that he ran away. Sitting on the roadside to rest himself he heard Bow Bells, and they seemed to him to say, "Turn again, Whittington, thrice Lord Mayor of London"; so he returned to his master. By and by, the latter allowed him, with the other servants, to put in an adventure in a ship bound for Morocco. Richard had nothing but a cat, which, however, he sent. Now it happened that the King of Morocco was troubled by mice, which Whittington's cat destroyed; and this so pleased His Majesty that he bought the mouser at a fabulous price. Dick commenced business with this money, soon rose to great wealth, married his master's daughter, was knighted, and thrice elected Lord Mayor of London, in 1398, 1406, and 1419.

Although Wither tells us that "care will kill a cat," the difficulty of putting an end to pussy has become proverbial. Shakspeare thus refers to it in these lines:

Tybalt—"What wouldst thou have of me?
Mer.—Good king of cats, nothing but one of your nine lives."
Romeo and Juliet, Act III., Sc. 1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In addition to their value as exterminators of rats and mice, cats possess a worth on account of their qualities as household prophets. Thus, if a cat sneezes thrice a cold is sure to run through the family; and Melton tells us that—

"When the cat washes her face over her ears, wee shall have great shore of raine."

In like manner the sneezing of a cat indicates good luck to a bride.

The origin of the well-known expression of "to bell the cat" is thus described by Sir Walter Scott in *Tales of a Grandfather*:

"The mice, being much annoyed by the persecutions of a cat, resolved that a bell should be hung round her neck to give notice of her approach. The measure was agreed to in full council, but one of a sager mice inquired 'Who would undertake to bell the cat?' When Lauder told this fable to a council of Scotch nobles, met to declaim against one Cochran, Archibald Douglas started up and exclaimed in thunder, 'I will!' and hence the sobriquet referred to."

The expression "to turn a cat in a pan" means to make a sudden change in one's political creed or religious faith for the sake of being in the ascendant, as a cat always lands on its feet no matter how turned or thrown.

That the rights of the cat were openly violated in former times is evident from many familiar old sayings which attest to the brutality with which pussy has been habitually subjected. Thus the expression, "Not room to swing a cat," has reference to the sport of swinging a cat to a branch of a tree as a mark to be shot at. Shakspeare refers to another variety of the sport; the cat being inclosed in a leather bottle and suspended to a tree and shot at: "Hang me in a bottle like a cat" (*Much Ado About Nothing*); and Steevers tells us of a third variety in which the "cat was placed in a soot-bag hung on a line, and the players had to beat out the bottom of the bag." He who succeeded in liberating the cat had the "privilege" of hunting it afterwards.

So again a favorite amusement of "the good old times," with a certain regiment quartered in Kilkenny, was to tie two cats together by the tails, swing them over a line, and watch their ferocious attacks upon each other in their endeavors to get free. It was determined to put down this cruel "sport," and one day just as the two unfortunate cats were strung, the alarm was given that the colonel was riding up at post haste. An officer present cut through their tails with his sword, which liberated the cats, who scampered off before the colonel arrived.

That a certain prejudice against cats has existed from early times cannot be denied. It is difficult to discover how it originated unless it be that it is derived from the old superstition that Satan's favorite form is that of a black cat; hence it is that that animal has been the familiar of witches from time immemorial. It will be remembered that Galinthis was changed by the Fates into a cat. Hecate, also, when Typhon compelled the gods and goddesses to hide themselves in animals, assumed the form of a cat. "Lady Jane," the large black cat of Krook, the grasping drunken rag and bone collector in *Bleak House*, who eventually dies of spontaneous combustion, belonged to this class and was quite as uncanny as her master.

The pictures of cats by Gottfried Mind are well known to every one. Indeed, this famous painter earned the sobriquet of "The Cat's Raphael," and he was by no means unworthy of this complimentary epithet, not only on account of the correctness of his drawings of those animals, but more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

especially for the life and spirit which he gave them in his pictures. It is interesting to note that this peculiar talent was awakened and discovered by chance. At the time when Fredenberger was painting his famous picture of "The Peasant Cleaving Wood Before His Cottage," his wife sitting by feeding her child with pap out of a pot round which a cat is prowling, Mind cast a broad stare on the sketch of this last figure, and said, "That is no cat!" Fredenberger asked, with a smile, whether he thought he could do better. Mind offered to try, went into a corner and drew the cat, which Fredenberger drew so well that he made his new pupil finish it out, and the master copied the scholar's work; for it is Mind's cat that is engraved in Fredenberger's plate.

Mind's affection for the feline race may be termed fraternal. When he was at work, a favorite cat generally sat by his side; and he was often seen employed at his table with an old cat on his lap and two or three kittens on his shoulders, or even in the hollow formed at the back of his neck by the inclination of his head. Thus encumbered he would sit for hours together at his work and abstain from any motion that could in the least encumber his devoted favorites. This eccentric artist died in 1815 at Berne, where his tombstone bears this inscription in Latin:

"Mourn, all ye cats! Ye bears in sorrow bend,
For death has robbed you of your dearest friend."

GERTRUDE B. ROLFE.

HOW TO REPEL TRAIN ROBBERS.

WITHOUT an exception, so far as I have ever seen or been able to ascertain, the express train is made up in the following order, viz., engine, tender, express or baggage cars, second-class coaches, first-class coaches, and, possibly, sleeping cars. This may safely be asserted as the "make-up" of trains west of the Mississippi and Ohio rivers—the most fruitful field of operations for train robbers. The general plan of attack is for one or possibly two members of the band to board the "blind-baggage" or forward platform of the car next to the tender, at some small station or other stopping place; then, at the opportune moment, to climb over the tender and cause the engineer, at the muzzles of their guns, to stop the train at some appointed place—usually some long trestle or deep ravine. Then either the engineer or fireman, or possibly both, are made to dismount from their cab and go back to the express-car, and call upon the messenger to open the door. If the latter does not comply promptly with the request then the door is forced by battering or by explosives. Successful thus far, the only other doubt that remains to be cleared away is as to the amount of money and valuables that the messenger has on this run. As to how well the robbers have guessed in the past, let the "Profit and Loss Account" of the several express companies show.

All of this devilish work has occupied but a few minutes, and then the train moves on, with the passengers and other members of the train crew possibly in ignorance. Had they known, however, doubtless the result would have been the same, for unless forewarned the railroad and express companies are rarely forearmed. And this must naturally be so, for, in the first place, the train has been brought to a stand-still on the trestle, so that no aid can come from the rear coaches to the front; and, in the second place, the train is lighted, and renders conspicuous as a target any brave man who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dares to sally forth. The robber is covered by darkness, and, I doubt not, a tree or a boulder besides. Should the express car fail to yield what they may consider a fair reward for their boldness, then the robbers turn their attention to the passengers. This, though, is believed to be the exception rather than the rule. In such an undertaking the chances for a large amount of booty are very small and the danger is very great.

In all raids upon express cars, it would seem that at least three points must be considerd by the robbers, viz.: 1. Danger; 2. Probability of a "big haul" of money and valuables; and 3. The number to share in the division of the stolen goods, or the individual gain. As to the prominence that is given to these three considerations, it matters not in this article, but the smaller the number of men that can accomplish the deed, the greater will the individual reward be. *Personal gain* is the incentive. Such a body of raiders are not out in quest of health or sport, but personal gain, pure and simple. The histories of such crimes would fix the number in the party at from two to five. Even one man, buoyed by a forlorn hope, has been known to attempt to hold up a train.

The Hon. Wade Hampton suggests, in his valuable paper,* that proper and adequate laws for the punishment of such criminals be enacted, that properly armed guards be placed on the car, that the car be made invulnerable, and, lastly, that bloodhounds be used to "run to ground" the robber.

Of the second and third suggestions, I question the real beneficial effects. It may safely be assumed that the "point of attack" is the engine and then the express car. Why then not separate them as much as possible, by putting the express car *the last* in the train? Have alarm bells in each coach and sleeper, which can be rung by the express messenger when he is directed or requested, *at this unusual time and place*, to open the door of his car. In each coach and sleeper have, in a glass-front case, similar to those now in use for the axe and saw, two repeating shotguns, each magazine containing five buckshot cartridges, thus giving from six to twelve most effective weapons into the hands of the train crew and passengers. The alarm bells should be electric, though it is believed that the ordinary cord bell could be made to serve the purpose. When the messenger sounds his tocsin of war, there would soon be a sufficient force of brave men at the express car to give the robbers a warm welcome. For the latter to cover the engine cab and each door and side of each coach or sleeper, would require a force of men too great in numbers to make "the divide" profitable. Besides the greater number of accomplices or principals, the greater the chances of a capture and the possibilities of some one turning "state's evidence."

Under such an arrangement in the make-up of a train, should the rear or express car be the sole point of attack, then the first step would be to cut this car loose from the train, and then loot it. The automatic air-brake would give the alarm to the engineer, and he, in turn, to the coaches; or, better still, the concealed electric wire could be so arranged as to sound the alarm when the car parted from the train. Should the engine, as in the past, be the first point of attack, then the crew and passengers (armed) have the advantage of being between the forces of robbers, and, with every probability, can throw the greater number in the fight, and, Napoleon-like, repulse or defeat in detail.

Under the present order of things, the crime of "holding up" trains has

* NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, December, 1894.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

become one of almost daily or weekly occurrence. And why? Because two, three, or four men can successfully effect it, and the ill-gotten gains are large. Render the act one more difficult and dangerous of accomplishment, and the attempts will be less frequent. It matters not how invulnerable the car, so long as it remains in the train near the engine it will offer but slight resistance to the robber and his stick of dynamite.

To have one or two special guards on every express car would not only entail a heavy expense to the express companies, but more helpless beings can't be conceived of than these guards securely locked *inside* of the car while the determined and desperate robber *outside* is deliberately lighting the fuse that so soon will aid him in his hellish designs. Verily their hands are tied when they are placed inside the car, and the robber resorts to dynamite. To make the proposed change would be comparatively inexpensive. Indeed, by a mutual agreement between the railroad and express companies, this extra expense might be made very small.

The modern vestibule now in use on some of the wealthier roads of the country is an important factor in the solution of this problem. It is a safeguard to the travelling public against the raids of the train robber, and especially advantageous is it, or it could be made so, for the express car (when the last in the train) to have this connection to the main body. It furnishes a comparatively safe line of communication for the defensive party, and especially valuable is it if it prevents the robber from cutting off the express car from the train.

The principle of the suggestions herein offered first presented itself to me while stationed in Oklahoma Territory, the train robbers' paradise. Having been ordered to take command of a small detachment of United States soldiers to guard the funds of the paymaster while going from the express office to the post, the question at once presented itself as to how best to post the detachment so as to prevent an attack or capture by road agents. Usually there are two conveyances—the one for the paymaster, his clerk, and the funds, the other for the guard. The following plan was always adopted: The conveyance carrying the funds moved out first, and the other carrying the guard followed, but never closer than 100 to 150 yards in open country. If the country became rough and rugged, then the distance was diminished, but always with this object in view – to keep far enough away from the funds to compel the attacking party to divide its forces *in order to hold up*, and at the same time to ensure the guard's being at all times within striking distance. This principle I would apply to the proper guarding and protecting of express trains, except that in this case the defensive party has the advantage of position.

The use of bloodhounds would undoubtedly be valuable after the act is committed, but we must render it exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for the express car to be robbed, if we would put down "Brigandage on Our Railroads." As long as the aphorism "Nothing succeeds like success" is applicable to this criminal practice, then just so long will desperate and depraved men follow it.

JNO. T. KNIGHT,
First Lieutenant Third U. S. Calvary.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED